

CRS Report for Congress

Department of Homeland Security Grants to State and Local Governments: FY2003 to FY2006

December 22, 2006

Steven Maguire
Analyst in Public Finance
Government and Finance Division

Shawn Reese
Analyst in American National Government
Government and Finance Division



Prepared for Members and
Committees of Congress

Report Documentation Page			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
<p>Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.</p>				
1. REPORT DATE 22 DEC 2006	2. REPORT TYPE N/A	3. DATES COVERED -		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Department of Homeland Security Grants to State and Local Governments: FY2003 to FY2006			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
			5b. GRANT NUMBER	
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)			5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
			5e. TASK NUMBER	
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Congressional Research Service The Library of Congress 101 Independence Avenue, SE Washington, DC 20540-7500			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release, distribution unlimited				
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The original document contains color images.				
14. ABSTRACT				
15. SUBJECT TERMS				
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT SAR	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 59
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified		

Department of Homeland Security Grants to State and Local Governments: FY2003 to FY2006

Summary

This report analyzes federal grants to state and local governments that are administered by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). These grants, which are allocated primarily at the discretion of DHS, are intended to enhance homeland security.

This report summarizes seven DHS grant programs — the State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP), the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI), the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program (LETPP), the Emergency Management Performance Grant Program (EMPG), the Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS), the Citizen Corps Program (CCP), and the Critical Infrastructure Protection Program (CIP — funded only in FY2003). These seven DHS programs were chosen for analysis because the allocations were made to state and local governments, not to private individuals or entities. These seven programs accounted for \$1.85 billion in FY2006.

The report also provides a state-by-state analysis of state and local spending on public safety more generally. The homeland security grants described in this report are likely included in the public safety categories of spending as reported by the states and tabulated by the U.S. Census Bureau. The federal grants identified in this report are a relatively small portion of overall public safety spending, ranging from 0.48% in Virginia to a maximum of 5.6% in North Dakota.

Contents

Introduction	1
DHS State and Local Assistance Programs: An Overview	2
State Homeland Security Grant Program	4
Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program	5
Urban Area Security Initiative	6
Critical Infrastructure Protection Program	7
Emergency Management Performance Grant Program	7
Metropolitan Medical Response System	8
Citizen Corps Program	9
Evolution of Grant Allocation Methods	9
Risk and Threat Assessment	10
Congressional Response to FY2006 Allocations	10
Federal Goals and State and Local Spending	
on Homeland Security	15
State and Local Spending on Public Safety	16
Implications for Homeland Security Grant Program Allocations	16
Methodological Note	17
Appendix	21

List of Tables

Table 1. DHS Homeland Security Grants: Funding for FY2006	3
Table 2. FY2003-FY2006 Homeland Security Grant Allocation Methods	12
Table 3. State and Local Spending on Public Safety, Selected Measures	18
Table A. State Allocations of Office of Grants and Training Homeland Security Grants	21

Department of Homeland Security Grants to State and Local Governments: FY2003 to FY2006

Introduction

This report summarizes seven programs that make homeland security grants to states and selected local governments, and it analyzes the distribution of those grants from FY2003 through FY2006. The seven grant programs, which are identified below, are administered by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and are designed to help elected state and local general-purpose governments enhance their homeland security capabilities.

The report does not include all federal assistance programs with homeland security or public safety components. It does not include such programs as Community Oriented Policing Services and Justice Assistance Grants.¹ Nor does it include discretionary grants intended for such critical infrastructure sectors as ports, rail and intercity bus systems, trucking, and buffer zone protection; these grants are not allocated to elected, general-purpose state and local governments, but to private, non-governmental, or special-purpose governmental organizations. Finally, the report does not cover the Firefighter Grant Program because its grants are made not to general-purpose governments, but directly to individual fire departments, be they municipal or volunteer, and because the grant allocation method is different.²

The discussion that follows first summarizes the seven programs — their intent, eligible recipients, and eligible activities — and then reviews the evolution of the methods DHS has used to allocate funds in those programs. Finally, the report examines how important the grants are in overall public safety spending by the state and local governments that receive the grants. The rough estimates resulting from this CRS analysis suggest that the DHS homeland security grants are relatively small when compared to the level of recent state public safety expenditures. The ratio of grant amounts to total state public safety spending averages 1.39%,³ and ranges from

¹ Community Oriented Policing Services and Justice Assistance Grants, within the Department of Justice, provide funding for numerous public safety activities that may not be considered as part of homeland security.

² For more on the Firefighter Grant Program, see CRS Report RS21302, *Assistance to Firefighters Program*, by Len Kruger. The appropriation for the program for FY2007 was \$662 million. For information on the distribution of grants among the states, see CRS Report RL32341, *Assistance to Firefighters Program: Distribution of Fire Grant Funding*, by Len Kruger.

³ Among the states (i.e., excluding the District of Columbia), the mean is 1.39%; the median (continued...)

approximately 0.5% in Virginia to approximately 5.6% in North Dakota.⁴ The ratio is less than 1% in 23 states, less than 2% in 41 states, and less than 3% in 46 states.

DHS State and Local Assistance Programs: An Overview

Before the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks and the subsequent creation of DHS, state and local governments were eligible for three grants pertinent to homeland security: the State Domestic Preparedness Program (SDPP) administered by the Department of Justice (DOJ) through the Office for Domestic Preparedness (ODP),⁵ the Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) Program administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and the Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS) administered by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). These three grant programs were subsequently augmented with the funding of four more homeland security grant programs. To date, the seven programs are

- State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP) — formerly called the State Domestic Preparedness Program (SDPP),⁶
- Emergency Management Performance Grant Program (EMPG),⁷
- Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS),⁸
- Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program (LETPP),⁹
- Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI),¹⁰
- Critical Infrastructure Protection Program (CIP),¹¹ and
- Citizen Corps Program (CCP).¹²

³ (...continued)

is 1.0%.

⁴ The District of Columbia, with grants representing 6.74% of total public safety spending, is greater than North Dakota, but is a special case because it is not a state and is home to the federal government.

⁵ The Office for Domestic Preparedness was transferred to DHS in FY2003 (P.L. 107-296), and renamed the Office of Grants and Training, within DHS, in FY2006.

⁶ The State Domestic Preparedness Program was renamed and transferred to DHS in FY2003 (P.L. 107-296). Funded at the time of transfer through appropriations for FY2003 (P.L. 108-7 and P.L. 108-11).

⁷ Transferred to DHS in FY2003 (P.L. 107-296). Funded at the time of transfer through appropriations for FY2003 (P.L. 108-7 and P.L. 108-11).

⁸ Transferred to DHS in FY2003 (P.L. 107-296).

⁹ Funded at the time of transfer through DHS appropriations for FY2004 (P.L. 108-90).

¹⁰ Funded at the time of transfer through appropriations for FY2003 (P.L. 108-7 and P.L. 108-11).

¹¹ Funded only in FY2003 through appropriations for that year (P.L. 108-7 and P.L. 108-11).

¹² Funded at the time of transfer through appropriations for FY2003 (P.L. 108-7 and P.L. 108-11).

States; the District of Columbia; U.S. insular areas; and certain high-risk, high-threat urban areas are eligible for one or more of these programs.¹³ Funding for the seven programs for FY2006 is shown in **Table 1**, below.

Table 1. DHS Homeland Security Grants: Funding for FY2006¹⁴

DHS Program	FY2006 Funding	
	Amount (\$millions)	Share of Total
Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI)	\$711	38.4%
State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP)	\$528	28.5%
Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program (LETPP)	\$384	20.8%
Emergency Management Performance Grant Program (EMPG)	\$179	9.7%
Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS)	\$29	1.6%
Citizen Corps Program (CCP)	\$19	1.0%
Critical Infrastructure Protection Program (CIP)	\$0	0.0%
Total	\$1,850	100.0%

Source: P.L. 109-90 (FY2006 DHS Appropriations).

Funds for five of the seven programs — SHSGP, LETPP, CIP, EMPG, and CCP — are appropriated and allocated among the states in accord with the provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act, which says that states are to use the grants

in conjunction with units of local government, to enhance the capability of State and local jurisdictions to prepare for and respond to terrorist acts including events of terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction and biological, nuclear, radiological, incendiary, chemical, and explosive devices.¹⁵

The act also says, “Grants under this section may be used to purchase needed equipment and to provide training and technical assistance to State and local first responders.”¹⁶

The act goes on to authorize appropriations for FY2002 through FY2007 and sets a minimum allocation to states and territories:

Each State shall be allocated in each fiscal year under this section not less than 0.75 percent of the total amount appropriated in the fiscal year for grants pursuant to this section, except that the United States Virgin Islands,

¹³ Only metropolitan medical systems, however, are eligible for MMRS grants.

¹⁴ Congress appropriated the FY2007 amounts for these programs in P.L. 109-295, but DHS has yet to allocate funds to states, urban areas, and U.S. insular areas. When DHS announces these allocations, this report will be updated.

¹⁵ P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014(a).

¹⁶ P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014 (b).

America Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands each shall be allocated 0.25 percent.¹⁷

The other two programs — UASI and MMRS — provide grants allocated to certain urban areas and metropolitan medical systems entirely at the discretion of DHS. The only constraint on departmental administrative discretion is the budget authority appropriated for the programs for each fiscal year.

Over the years, the DHS method of allocating discretionary grant amounts has changed. **Table 2** traces the grant allocation method for each of the programs for each fiscal year since FY2003. **Table A** in the appendix presents the funding for each program for FY2003 through FY2006, by state. **Table A** also presents the per capita amounts for each state and the growth rate over the four-year period. A description of the programs and their objectives follows below.

Within DHS, the Office of Grants and Training (G&T) administers these homeland security assistance grants for state and local governments. The grants help such state and local entities as law enforcement agencies, fire departments, emergency medical services, hospitals, and emergency managers prepare for, prevent, mitigate, and respond to manmade or natural disasters.

Although DHS appropriations for FY2007 have been passed and signed by the President (P.L. 109-295), as of this writing, DHS had not made the FY2007 allocations. Accordingly, the most recent information on program allocations is for FY2006. That amount for each program is shown in italics below. This report will be updated when DHS announces the FY2007 allocations.

State Homeland Security Grant Program. (*\$528 million for FY2006*) SHSGP provides assistance to state and local entities to prepare for terrorist attacks involving weapons of mass destruction (WMD). It authorizes purchase of specialized equipment to enhance state and local agencies' capability in preventing and responding to WMD incidents and other terrorist incidents, and provides funds for protecting critical infrastructure of national importance. This program provides funds for designing, developing, conducting, and evaluating terrorism response exercises; developing and conducting counter-terrorism training programs; and updating and implementing each state's Homeland Security Strategy (SHSS).¹⁸

Funds from this program may also be used to plan, design, develop, conduct, and evaluate exercises that train first responders, and to assess the readiness of state and local jurisdictions to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks. Exercises must be threat- and performance-based, in accordance with G&T's Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) manuals.¹⁹ Allowable training costs include establishment of new training programs within existing training academies,

¹⁷ P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014(c).

¹⁸ U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office of Grants and Training, *Fiscal Year 2006 Homeland Security Grant Program: Program Guidance and Application Kit* (Washington: 2005), p. 2.

¹⁹ Ibid.

universities, and junior colleges.²⁰ In accordance with their approved homeland security plans, states must allocate 80% of the grant funds to localities. There is no state or local matching fund requirement for this program.

States are the only authorized applicants, with the following state and local entities eligible to receive and use funding:

- emergency management agencies or offices,
- homeland security agencies or offices,
- fire departments,
- law enforcement agencies,
- emergency medical services,
- hazardous material-handling personnel,
- public works agencies,
- public health agencies,
- governmental administrative agencies or offices, and
- public safety communication agencies or offices.²¹

This program represented 28.5% of federal grants to state and local governments for public safety analyzed here for FY2006.²² Since FY2003, however, SHSGP allocations have declined 74.4%, due to the reduction in appropriations for the program. In FY2003, just over \$2 billion was distributed, or roughly \$7.18 per capita. In FY2006, the per capita spending was \$1.78. The total spending under the SHSGP over the FY2003 to FY2006 period has been \$5.34 billion, or over half of the total amount provided through these seven grant programs.

Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program. (*\$384 million for FY2006*) In FY2004 DHS appropriations, Congress directed DHS to establish a local law enforcement terrorism prevention program for states and localities.²³ LETPP provides funds to support activities to establish and enhance state and local law enforcement efforts to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks. In accordance with their approved homeland security plans, states must allocate 80% of the grant funds to localities.

Authorized program activities include the following:

- information sharing to preempt terrorist attacks,
- target hardening to reduce vulnerability of identified high value targets,
- recognition of potential or actual threats, and
- interdiction of terrorists and terrorist cells.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 3.

²¹ Ibid., p. 2.

²² The percentage is based on the total spending in the seven programs analyzed in this report.

²³ P.L. 108-90, Title III.

Approved costs for the program include, but are not limited to, personnel costs (overtime as approved by the state administering agency), equipment, computer systems, and related expenses.²⁴ State and local law enforcement entities are eligible to receive funding from this program. There is no matching requirement for this program.

This program represented almost 20.8% of federal assistance to state and local governments through the programs analyzed here for FY2006. Since FY2004, the first year of the program, LETPP allocations have declined 23.2%. In FY2004, \$500 million was distributed, or roughly \$1.72 per capita. In FY2006, the per capita spending was \$1.30. Over the FY2003 to FY2006 window, \$1.27 billion has been allocated through this program.

Urban Area Security Initiative. (*\$711 million for FY2006*) UASI is a discretionary program that provides funding to high-risk, high-threat urban areas (including counties and mutual aid partners), to prepare for, prevent, and respond to terrorist incidents.

The identified high-risk, high-threat urban areas are authorized to use funds to purchase specialized WMD equipment, plan and execute exercises, pay first responder overtime costs associated with heightened Homeland Security Advisory System threat levels, and train first responders. Additionally, funds from this program can be used for port and mass transit security, radiological defense systems, pilot projects, and technical assistance.²⁵

The DHS Secretary determines which urban areas are to receive funding, and the following local entities are eligible to receive funding:

- emergency management agencies or offices,
- homeland security agencies or offices,
- fire departments,
- law enforcement agencies,
- emergency medical services,
- hazardous material-handling personnel,
- public works agencies,
- public health agencies,
- governmental administrative agencies or offices, and
- public safety communication agencies or offices.²⁶

In FY2003, the UASI program distributed \$596 billion, or \$2.07 per capita, to 29 metropolitan areas. Unlike the first two programs, UASI grants increased over 19% from FY2003 to FY2006. Nationally, per capita spending increased to \$2.40, but because more metropolitan areas were included in the eligible list of recipients

²⁴ S.Rept. 108-86 to accompany P.L. 108-334.

²⁵ U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office of Grants and Training, *Fiscal Year 2006 Homeland Security Grant Program: Program Guidance and Application Kit*, p. 2.

²⁶ Ibid.

in FY2006 (46 metropolitan areas), many individual metropolitan areas actually realized a decline in per capita allocations. In addition, the FY2006 amount was roughly \$139 million less than the FY2005 allocations. Nevertheless, over the FY2003 to FY2006 budget window, over \$2.8 billion has been distributed through the UASI program. This amount represents about 27% of the total aid distributed through these programs.

Critical Infrastructure Protection Program. (*Program expired*) As part of the FY2003 SHSGP, funding was provided to pay for costs associated with increased security measures at critical infrastructure sites during the invasion of Iraq (March 17, 2003, to April 16, 2003) and future periods of heightened threat. States and localities were to consider critical infrastructure to include any system or asset an attack on which would result in catastrophic loss of life or catastrophic economic loss. States and localities were to consider some of the following types of infrastructure:

- public water systems,
- data storage and processing facilities,
- chemical facilities,
- major power generation facilities,
- rail and highway bridges,
- natural gas transmission pipelines,
- petroleum handling facilities, and
- mass transit subway systems.²⁷

CIP was funded with a total of \$200 million in FY2003. The base amount for each state, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico was 0.75%, and U.S. insular areas received a base of 0.25%. DHS, given the discretion to allocate the remainder, used the jurisdiction's portion of the U.S. population as the basis for allocation. The CIP program was in place for FY2003 only and represented 6.5% of total grants to state and local governments in that year.

Emergency Management Performance Grant Program. (\$179 million for FY2006) EMPG is designed to assist in the development, maintenance, and improvement of state and local emergency management capabilities. It provides support to state and local governments to achieve measurable results in key functional areas of emergency management.²⁸ The distribution of funds from states to localities is at the discretion of each state's EMPG administering agency, typically the state emergency management agency or office. The state matching requirement for the program is 50%.

EMPG funds are used for emergency management personnel costs, travel, training, supplies, and other routine expenditures for emergency management

²⁷ U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office for Domestic Preparedness, *Fiscal Year 2003 State Homeland Security Grant Program: Program Guidance and Application Kit, Part II* (Washington: 2003), Annex A.

²⁸ U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office of Grants and Training, *Fiscal Year 2006 Homeland Security Grant Program: Program Guidance and Application Kit*, p. 2.

activities. Funds for the program may also be used for consequence management preparedness projects and programs that develop and improve the capabilities of states and localities to prepare for, respond to, and recover from terrorist incidents.²⁹

States may use the funds provided through EMPG to structure their individual emergency management programs based on identified needs and priorities for strengthening emergency management capabilities. States may also use EMPG funds to develop intrastate emergency management systems that encourage partnership building among government, business, and volunteer and community organizations.³⁰

In FY2006, EMPG grants accounted for 9.7% of total DHS grants to state and local governments, approximately \$0.61 per capita. In FY2003, EMPG grants totaled \$165 million, or \$0.57 per capita. From FY2003 to FY2006, EMPG grants increased 8.7%, and \$692 million has been allocated.

Metropolitan Medical Response System. (\$29 million for FY2006)

The MMRS program assists DHS-selected jurisdictions with funding to develop plans and training, and conduct exercises related to terrorist attacks. Funding is intended to enhance jurisdictions' capability in responding to WMD mass casualty events. Additionally, the program is used to prepare identified jurisdictions for mass casualty incidents involving hazardous materials, epidemic disease outbreaks, or natural disasters. The program intends to promote coordination among first responders, medical treatment resources, public health officials, emergency management offices, volunteer organizations, and other local entities to reduce the catastrophic effects of a terrorist attack. Program funding is awarded in three categories:

- Capability Focus: Prepares localities to respond to WMD threats;
- Sustainment Focus: Provides funding for planning, training, and equipment needed to maintain a locality's capability to respond to human health needs in the event of a mass casualty incident; and
- Special Project Focus: Provides funding for innovative solutions to local issues and publicizes their applicability to localities across the nation.³¹

In FY2006, the MMRS allocation was 31.9% less than the allocation in FY2003 of \$42.29 million. The FY2006 amount was just 1.6% of the total amount of grants awarded to state and local governments. On a per capita basis, the allocation has dropped from \$0.15 to \$0.10.³²

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency, "MMRS Fact Sheet," available at [<http://mmrs.fema.gov/main/events/mmrssfactsheet.aspx>].

³² For additional information on the MMRS, see CRS Report RL31719, *An Overview of the U.S. Public Health System in the Context of Emergency Preparedness*, by Sarah A. Lister.

Citizen Corps Program. (*\$19 million for FY2006*) On January 29, 2002, President Bush issued an executive order establishing the USA Freedom Corps.³³ The USA Freedom Corps' mission is to increase opportunities for citizens to participate in their communities by expanding and enhancing public service. Within the USA Freedom Corps, the Citizen Corps Program was created to coordinate volunteer organizations with the mission to make local communities safe and prepared to respond to any emergency situation. Community Emergency Response Teams (CERT) is the only program that the Citizen Corps administers that funds volunteer first responders.³⁴

CERT trains citizens to be prepared to respond to emergency situations in their own local communities. CERTs are groups of volunteers within communities who are trained by professional first responders to assist in the event of a manmade or natural disaster. CERT volunteers give support to first responders, provide immediate assistance to victims, and organize spontaneous volunteers at a disaster site. The program authorizes the funding to provide training to CERT volunteers.

This is the smallest of the seven programs analyzed here. In FY2003, \$18.8 million was dedicated to the Citizen Corps Program, or approximately 0.6% of all grants in that year. In FY2006, the Citizen Corps Program was allocated 1.0% of the total grants awarded, and the FY2006 CCP allocation was 2.2% more than in FY2003.

Evolution of Grant Allocation Methods

Congress gave DHS a considerable degree of discretion to allocate homeland security grants among eligible states and urban areas. As noted in **Table 2**, the only constraints on that discretion are

- the total amounts appropriated for any given fiscal year;
- instructions in the USA PATRIOT Act setting minimum grant amounts (applicable to the SHSGP, LETPP, CIP, EMPG, and CCP programs); and
- an appropriations act (P.L. 108-334, Title III) instruction for FY2005 directing DHS to allocate the remainder for SHSGP, LETPP, EMPG, and CCP as it had done in FY2004 (i.e., in direct proportion to state population).

Within those constraints, the DHS method for allocating SHSGP, LETPP, EMPG, and CCP funds remaining after state and territorial minimums are met has evolved to reflect the department's calculations of risk, need, and the homeland security capacities of grant recipients. **Table 2** traces the annual steps in this evolution.

³³ U.S. President Bush, "Establishing the USA Freedom Corps," Executive Order 13254, *Federal Register*, vol. 67, Feb. 1, 2002, Sec. 1, p. 4869.

³⁴ Besides CERT, the other Citizen Corps Programs include Volunteers in Police Service, Enhanced Neighborhood Watch, and Medical Response Corps.

In FY2003, the first year of the grant programs, DHS chose to allocate the remainder for SHSGP, CIP, EMPG, and CCP in proportion to the state's population. In FY2004, the department used the same method for all those programs except CIP, which was not funded after FY2003. In FY2005, the appropriations act for that year directed DHS once again to allocate the remainder in proportion to population. In FY2006, however, for SHSGP and LETPP, DHS decided to evaluate and score homeland security grant applications on the basis of *risk* and the expected *effectiveness* of the applicant's proposed solutions to identified homeland security *needs*. DHS allocated two-thirds of the remainder using its risk and threat assessments and scoring system. It allocated one-third of the remainder based on how well the state's application demonstrated state capacity to effectively use federal homeland security assistance.

From FY2003 through FY2006, DHS has allocated UASI grants at its own discretion. From FY2003 through FY2005, the allocations of UASI grants were based on risk and threat assessments. In FY2006, DHS chose to allocate two-thirds of each UASI grant based on risk and threat assessments and one-third based on how well applications demonstrated the ability to effectively use federal homeland security assistance (see **Table 2**).

As with grants to states, DHS reasoned that using the effectiveness component rewards "the significant efforts undertaken by applicants in presenting effective solutions."³⁵

Risk and Threat Assessment. According to DHS, the degree of risk is determined (or measured) using three variables: threat, consequences, and vulnerability.³⁶ DHS further evaluates the risk associated with specific *assets* and *geographic attributes* using these variables. Shopping malls and airports are examples of *assets*, and gross domestic product (GDP) and ratio of law enforcement to population are examples of *geographic attributes*. DHS adds the score for asset risk to the score for geographic attribute risk to arrive at *total risk*. DHS describes the two risk measures as complementary, though asset risk and geographic attribute risk arguably overlap. For example, the GDP of a location (a "geographic attribute") and the number and value of assets are likely highly correlated. Thus, adding the two risk measures would tend to overvalue *total risk*.

Congressional Response to FY2006 Allocations

DHS was criticized after the most recent allocation announcement, in part because most jurisdictions received considerably less than in past years. In addition, a new factor, effectiveness of proposed spending, was considered in this round (FY2006) of allocations. Less effective proposals, as determined by a peer review process, received less than they would have otherwise. What is unclear to many is whether there exists a risk threshold where effectiveness would be irrelevant. For example, if a jurisdiction submitted an ineffective plan for protecting a high risk

³⁵ FY2006 HSGP Fact Sheet, *Allocation Methodology*.

³⁶ Tracy Henke, DHS, Assistant Secretary for Grants and Training, Press Release, May 31, 2006.

target, should the federal government fully fund an alternative mitigation strategy based on peer recommendations?

DHS was also criticized for not providing enough guidance to the state and local governments applying for grants. For more on DHS's allocation methods and issues, see CRS Report RL33583, *Homeland Security Grants: Evolution of Program Guidance and Grant Allocation Methods*, by Shawn Reese.

Table 2. FY2003-FY2006 Homeland Security Grant Allocation Methods

Program	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006*
SHSGP	<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Remainder of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 108-7, P.L. 108-11]</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> DHS chose to allocate the remainder of total SHSGP appropriations in direct proportion to the state's percentage of the nation's population. [FY2003 SHSGP Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Remainder of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 108-90, Title III]</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> DHS chose to allocate the remainder of total SHSGP appropriations in direct proportion to the state's percentage of the nation's population. [FY2004 SHSGP Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Congress required DHS to allocate the remainder of total appropriations in the same manner as in FY2004. [P.L. 108-334, Title III]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Remainder of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 109-90, Title III]</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> DHS chose to allocate the remainder of total SHSGP appropriations based on risk and the effectiveness of the state's proposed solutions to identified homeland security needs. [FY2006 HSGP Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>
LETPP	NA	<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Remainder of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 108-90, Title III]</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> DHS chose to allocate the remainder of total LETPP appropriations in direct proportion to the state's percentage of the nation's population. [FY2004 SHSGP Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Congress required DHS to allocate the remainder of total appropriations in the same manner as in FY2004. [P.L. 108-334, Title III]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Remainder of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 109-90, Title III]</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> DHS chose to allocate the remainder of total LETPP appropriations based on risk and the effectiveness of the state's proposed solution to identified homeland security needs. [FY2006 HSGP Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>

CRS-13

Program	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006*
UASI	<p>Guaranteed Amount NA</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Allocation of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 108-7, P.L. 108-11]</p> <p>DHS Implementation DHS allocated UASI funds based on the following indicators of risk: credible threat, presence of critical infrastructure, vulnerability, population, population density, law enforcement investigative and enforcement activity, and the existence of formal mutual aid agreements among jurisdictions.[FY2003 UASI Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount NA</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Allocation of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 108-90, Title III]</p> <p>DHS Implementation DHS allocated UASI funds based on the following indicators of risk: credible threat, presence of critical infrastructure, vulnerability, population, population density, law enforcement investigative and enforcement activity, and the existence of formal mutual aid agreements among jurisdictions.[FY2004 UASI Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount NA</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Allocation of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 108-334, Title III]</p> <p>DHS Implementation DHS allocated UASI funds based on the following indicators of risk: credible threat, presence of critical infrastructure, vulnerability, population, population density, law enforcement investigative and enforcement activity, and the existence of formal mutual aid agreements among jurisdictions.[FY2005 UASI Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount NA</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Allocation of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 109-90, Title III]</p> <p>DHS Implementation DHS allocated UASI funds based on risk and effectiveness of urban area's proposed solutions to identified homeland security needs. [FY2006 HSGP Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>
CIP	<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Remainder of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 108-7, P.L. 108-11]</p> <p>DHS Implementation DHS chose to allocate the remainder of total CIP appropriations in direct proportion to the state's percentage of the nation's population. [FY2003 SHSGP Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>	NA	NA	NA

Program	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006*
EMPG	<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Remainder of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 108-7, P.L. 108-11]</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> DHS chose to allocate the remainder of total EMPG appropriations in direct proportion to the state's percentage of the nation's population. [FY2003 SHSGP Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Remainder of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 108-90, Title III]</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> DHS chose to allocate the remainder of total EMPG appropriations in direct proportion to the state's percentage of the nation's population. [FY2004 SHSGP Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Congress required DHS to allocate the remainder of total appropriations in the same manner as in FY2004. [P.L. 108-334, Title III]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Remainder of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 109-90, Title III]</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> DHS chose to allocate the remainder of total EMPG appropriations in direct proportion to the state's percentage of the nation's population. [FY2006 HSGP Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>
CCP	<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Remainder of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 108-7, P.L. 108-11]</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> DHS chose to allocate the remainder of total CCP appropriations in direct proportion to the state's percentage of the nation's population. [FY2003 SHSGP Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Remainder of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 108-90, Title III]</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> DHS chose to allocate the remainder of total CCP appropriations in direct proportion to the state's percentage of the nation's population. [FY2004 SHSGP Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Congress required DHS to allocate the remainder of total appropriations in the same manner as in FY2004. [P.L. 108-334, Title III]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount Each state, DC, and Puerto Rico guaranteed 0.75% of total appropriations. [P.L. 107-56, Sec. 1014]</p> <p>Remainder of Appropriations Remainder of total appropriations at the discretion of DHS. [P.L. 109-90, Title III]</p> <p><i>DHS Implementation</i> DHS chose to allocate the remainder of total CCP appropriations in direct proportion to the state's percentage of the nation's population. [FY2006 HSGP Program Guidance and Application Kit]</p>
MMRS	<p>Guaranteed Amount DHS determines what metropolitan medical systems receive funding and amount. [P.L. 108-7 and P.L. 108-11]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount DHS determines what metropolitan medical systems receive funding and amount. [P.L. 108-90, Title III]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount DHS determines what metropolitan medical systems receive funding and amount. [P.L. 108-334, Title III]</p>	<p>Guaranteed Amount DHS determines what metropolitan medical systems receive funding and amount. [P.L. 109-90, Title III]</p>

*In the FY2007 DHS appropriations act (P.L. 109-295), Congress does not alter the funding methods for these grant programs. DHS has yet to announce the allocation of FY2007 discretionary funds.

Federal Goals and State and Local Spending on Homeland Security

Domestic public safety has traditionally been the responsibility of state and local governments; and within each state, spending that generates the greatest benefit for the *state* is a state priority. For the federal government, however, spending that generates the greatest benefit for the *nation* is a priority; and the federal government's priorities for additional spending do not always align with state objectives. Under the rubric of homeland security following the attacks of September 11, 2001, the federal government increased its role in public safety. The various grants to state and local governments, including the seven programs that are examined in this report and that are now primarily administered by DHS, are manifestations of an elevated federal role.

After the attacks of 9/11, a homeland security presidential directive (HSPD-8) identified the need to implement a “national preparedness goal” that would

establish policies to strengthen the preparedness of the United States to prevent and respond to threatened or actual domestic terrorist attacks, major disasters, and other emergencies by requiring a national domestic all-hazards preparedness goal, establishing mechanisms for improved delivery of Federal preparedness assistance to State and local governments, and outlining actions to strengthen preparedness capabilities of Federal, State, and local entities.³⁷

The definition for “Federal preparedness assistance” in HSPD-8 did suggest the notion that the federal aid is intended for preparedness spending whose benefit would be national in scope. The definition, however, was somewhat ambiguous because the catchall phrase “other emergencies” was included in it. Specifically, according to HSPD-8, federal preparedness assistance to state and local governments is intended “to prevent, prepare for, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks, major disasters, and *other emergencies*” [emphasis added]. Throughout HSPD-8, preparing for and responding to terrorist attacks is the primary concern. Since HSPD-8 was promulgated, DHS has issued several drafts of the *National Preparedness Goal*. Throughout those drafts, government spending that enhances *national* preparedness has remained a guiding principle.³⁸

In the American federal system, a variety of police, public health, emergency management, and other functions pertinent to homeland security are performed by state and local governments. Thus, to assess the importance of the seven federal homeland security grants relative to total public safety spending by state and local

³⁷ On December 17, 2003, the President issued Homeland Security Presidential Directive 8, *National Preparedness* (HSPD-8).

³⁸ For more information on the national preparedness goal as related to federal homeland security grants to states and selected urban areas, see CRS Report RL33583, *Homeland Security Grants: Evolution of Program Guidance and Grant Allocation Methods*, by Shawn Reese.

grant recipients, we must measure how much state and local governments spend on public safety and how expenditures vary among states.³⁹

State and Local Spending on Public Safety. Generally, spending on public safety is a strong indicator of a jurisdiction's provision of this government service.⁴⁰ The level of state and local spending on public safety varies considerably by state and could serve as a rough approximation of existing government supply (and thus public demand) for this service in the respective states. For example, in FY2004, total state and local spending on public safety in California was 1.86% of California's gross domestic product (GDP). In contrast, South Dakota dedicated 0.83% of its GDP to public safety spending (see **Table 3**, column 4).

Another means of measuring a state's provision of public safety is the spending on public safety relative to a national mean. In the United States, 1.39% of total U.S. GDP is devoted to public safety spending. Thus, if all states were equally invested in public safety, 1.39% of each state's GDP would be spent on fire, police, corrections, and protective inspections activities. Multiplying this percentage by GDP yields what a state would spend on public safety if it were spending the national average (or "par" value). If actual spending exceeds the estimated par value, then the state demands (and provides) relatively more public safety spending. Conversely, if a state is below the national average, then the citizens demand less public safety spending.

Using this method, each state can be scored in relation to par (see **Table 3**, column 5). Again, states over par spend relatively more on public safety, and those that are under par spend relatively less. **Table 3** presents the par calculation for each state based on FY2004 data provided by the U.S. Census Bureau. The top three states in relation to par are Florida (26.3% over par), California (25.3%), and Arizona (19.1%). The bottom three states are South Dakota (-67.2%), North Dakota (-63.5%), and New Hampshire (-51.7%).

Implications for Homeland Security Grant Program Allocations.

One perspective on public safety spending is that it reflects the needs, not necessarily the desires, of state and local governments. For example, of the top 10 states in public safety spending as a share of state GDP, all but Nevada are international border states, have extensive coastline, or both (see **Table 3**). One could argue that the national benefit from state and local spending on border control and monitoring is readily apparent. State and local public safety spending for the protection of critical infrastructure also generates a national benefit. These assets include, but are not limited to seaports, chemical facilities, federal facilities, dams, public utilities, oil and natural gas refineries and pipelines, financial centers, and transportation assets. Federal grants could be relatively larger for those states that spend more on

³⁹ DHS allocates grants to states and urban areas based on risk and other factors; but, as far as CRS can determine, the department does not explicitly consider current state and local spending on public safety.

⁴⁰ Another measure might be the actual output, like the number of police officers or fire houses. Still other measures might be the reduction in crime rates, or the number of crimes solved as a portion of total crimes committed.

activities that generate a measurable national benefit. The unpredictable nature of terrorism and terrorists' selection of targets, however, could lend credibility to the argument that states and localities without international borders or large concentrations of critical infrastructure assets may still need some level of federal homeland security assistance to ensure their preparedness and protection.

The extent to which the objectives behind the federal grant programs correspond with current state and local public safety spending objectives is critical. The additional federal funds for public safety spending will initially augment existing spending, but over time could begin to substitute for state and local own-source spending. This outcome would mean that the federal tax system, primarily federal income taxes, would substitute for state and local tax systems, typically property and sales taxes. The shift, however, would be relatively small, given that FY2006 public safety grants were about 1% of total state and local public safety spending in FY2004 (the latest available year for state and local public safety spending data).

Methodological Note. Data limitations are important to consider while reviewing the data presented in **Table 3**. First, **Table 3** reports data on Gross Domestic Product by state for the 2004 calendar year. More recent estimates are available, but the most recent state and local finance data are for fiscal year 2004. For most states, FY2004 ended on or near June 30, 2004. Thus, data on GDP by state for 2004 are the most appropriate to use for standardized comparison of states. Second, the last column in **Table 3** reports the FY2006 federal grants to states as shares of FY2004 state and local public safety spending. Ideally, data for state and local spending on public safety for FY2006 would be available, though the FY2004 data do allow for relatively robust comparisons among states. If FY2006 data were available, they would likely show that the FY2006 federal grants as shares of state and local public safety spending are less than reported in **Table 3**. The federal grants have declined, whereas state and local public safety spending has likely remained constant or increased in absolute terms since 2004.

Table 3. State and Local Spending on Public Safety, Selected Measures

State	Total S&L Public Safety Expenditures FY2004 (thousands)	2004 State Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (millions)	S&L Public Safety Spending as Share of State GDP	Over/Under Amount Relative to National Average	Over/Under as Percentage of S&L Spending	Total DHS Grants, FY2006	
						Amount	Share of S&L Public Safety Expenditures
Alabama	\$1,764,422	\$141,366	1.25%	(\$197,603)	-11.2%	\$15,578,025	0.9%
Alaska	\$490,536	\$35,988	1.36%	(\$8,943)	-1.8%	\$8,294,137	1.7%
Arizona	\$3,333,580	\$194,246	1.72%	\$637,632	19.1%	\$20,170,965	0.6%
Arkansas	\$1,136,281	\$82,712	1.37%	(\$11,682)	-1.0%	\$8,342,875	0.7%
California	\$28,208,145	\$1,519,202	1.86%	\$7,123,076	25.3%	\$231,950,605	0.8%
Colorado	\$2,561,220	\$201,392	1.27%	(\$233,908)	-9.1%	\$21,079,809	0.8%
Connecticut	\$1,905,816	\$182,468	1.04%	(\$626,665)	-32.9%	\$13,520,893	0.7%
Delaware	\$484,160	\$52,298	0.93%	(\$241,686)	-49.9%	\$10,296,370	2.1%
D.C.	\$801,682	\$77,510	1.03%	(\$274,083)	-34.2%	\$54,015,142	6.7%
Florida	\$11,470,989	\$609,372	1.88%	\$3,013,489	26.3%	\$100,122,080	0.9%
Georgia	\$4,426,127	\$339,730	1.30%	(\$289,000)	-6.5%	\$44,406,375	1.0%
Hawaii	\$572,420	\$50,238	1.14%	(\$124,835)	-21.8%	\$12,935,242	2.3%
Idaho	\$640,210	\$43,509	1.47%	\$36,347	5.7%	\$11,758,809	1.8%
Illinois	\$7,064,410	\$533,735	1.32%	(\$343,321)	-4.9%	\$90,405,480	1.3%
Indiana	\$2,417,932	\$229,449	1.05%	(\$766,600)	-31.7%	\$21,129,053	0.9%
Iowa	\$1,019,956	\$110,210	0.93%	(\$509,653)	-50.0%	\$13,480,048	1.3%
Kansas	\$1,230,507	\$98,927	1.24%	(\$142,505)	-11.6%	\$14,273,884	1.2%
Kentucky	\$1,624,188	\$133,003	1.22%	(\$221,766)	-13.7%	\$24,118,634	1.5%
Louisiana	\$2,356,127	\$160,186	1.47%	\$132,899	5.6%	\$30,436,715	1.3%

State	Total S&L Public Safety Expenditures FY2004 (thousands)	2004 State Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (millions)	S&L Public Safety Spending as Share of State GDP	Over/Under Amount Relative to National Average	Over/Under as Percentage of S&L Spending	Total DHS Grants, FY2006	
						Amount	Share of S&L Public Safety Expenditures
Maine	\$517,738	\$43,258	1.20%	(\$82,642)	-16.0%	\$7,784,686	1.5%
Maryland	\$3,503,625	\$230,698	1.52%	\$301,758	8.6%	\$24,290,987	0.7%
Massachusetts	\$3,533,282	\$312,700	1.13%	(\$806,695)	-22.8%	\$41,246,241	1.2%
Michigan	\$5,467,987	\$366,601	1.49%	\$379,916	6.9%	\$46,898,876	0.9%
Minnesota	\$2,345,018	\$224,620	1.04%	(\$772,493)	-32.9%	\$13,395,399	0.6%
Mississippi	\$1,128,986	\$77,107	1.46%	\$58,815	5.2%	\$8,528,314	0.8%
Missouri	\$2,419,289	\$205,847	1.18%	(\$437,670)	-18.1%	\$42,860,979	1.8%
Montana	\$356,288	\$27,583	1.29%	(\$26,538)	-7.4%	\$7,929,901	2.2%
Nebraska	\$711,620	\$67,989	1.05%	(\$232,002)	-32.6%	\$21,746,103	3.1%
Nevada	\$1,612,240	\$99,143	1.63%	\$236,230	14.7%	\$20,508,913	1.3%
New Hampshire	\$476,545	\$52,084	0.92%	(\$246,331)	-51.7%	\$7,886,573	1.7%
New Jersey	\$5,181,668	\$410,306	1.26%	(\$512,986)	-9.9%	\$51,982,785	1.0%
New Mexico	\$990,473	\$63,645	1.56%	\$107,141	10.8%	\$8,270,273	0.8%
New York	\$14,557,355	\$906,783	1.61%	\$1,972,075	13.5%	\$183,673,552	1.3%
North Carolina	\$3,457,217	\$323,962	1.07%	(\$1,039,065)	-30.1%	\$30,483,786	0.9%
North Dakota	\$192,622	\$22,692	0.85%	(\$122,321)	-63.5%	\$10,788,443	5.6%
Ohio	\$5,710,111	\$425,173	1.34%	(\$190,883)	-3.3%	\$41,347,339	0.7%
Oklahoma	\$1,504,172	\$111,838	1.35%	(\$48,032)	-3.2%	\$19,496,662	1.3%
Oregon	\$2,173,637	\$134,615	1.61%	\$305,310	14.0%	\$17,955,904	0.8%
Pennsylvania	\$5,591,577	\$463,752	1.21%	(\$844,857)	-15.1%	\$49,335,020	0.9%
Rhode Island	\$669,989	\$41,844	1.60%	\$89,234	13.3%	\$7,837,616	1.2%

State	Total S&L Public Safety Expenditures FY2004 (thousands)	2004 State Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (millions)	S&L Public Safety Spending as Share of State GDP	Over/Under Amount Relative to National Average	Over/Under as Percentage of S&L Spending	Total DHS Grants, FY2006	
						Amount	Share of S&L Public Safety Expenditures
South Carolina	\$1,601,653	\$131,492	1.22%	(\$223,330)	-13.9%	\$14,679,434	0.9%
South Dakota	\$246,481	\$29,699	0.83%	(\$165,713)	-67.2%	\$7,733,780	3.1%
Tennessee	\$2,197,748	\$216,769	1.01%	(\$810,798)	-36.9%	\$13,761,872	0.6%
Texas	\$10,088,160	\$903,208	1.12%	(\$2,447,502)	-24.3%	\$89,880,352	0.9%
Utah	\$1,025,243	\$82,546	1.24%	(\$120,416)	-11.7%	\$8,271,012	0.8%
Vermont	\$228,978	\$21,992	1.04%	(\$76,250)	-33.3%	\$10,907,921	4.8%
Virginia	\$3,555,043	\$327,032	1.09%	(\$983,848)	-27.7%	\$16,888,018	0.5%
Washington	\$3,316,389	\$253,085	1.31%	(\$196,188)	-5.9%	\$32,221,988	1.0%
West Virginia	\$498,085	\$49,903	1.00%	(\$194,521)	-39.1%	\$13,293,669	2.7%
Wisconsin	\$3,107,195	\$207,739	1.50%	\$223,977	7.2%	\$24,430,858	0.8%
Wyoming	\$289,768	\$24,092	1.20%	(\$44,606)	-15.4%	\$7,673,562	2.6%
United States	\$161,764,890	\$11,655,338	1.39%	na	na	\$1,650,307,965	1.0%

Appendix

**Table A. State Allocations of Office of Grants and Training
Homeland Security Grants**

(all amounts in millions except dollar per capita figures)

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)					Per Capita Amount					
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
Alabama											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$88.64	\$34.51	\$28.14	\$17.69	\$8.30	-75.9%	\$7.70	\$6.25	\$3.91	\$1.82	-76.4%
LETPP	\$20.81	na	\$8.35	\$6.43	\$6.03	-27.8%	\$0.00	\$1.85	\$1.42	\$1.32	-28.7%
EMPG	\$11.53	\$2.75	\$2.89	\$2.90	\$2.99	8.7%	\$0.61	\$0.64	\$0.64	\$0.66	6.9%
MMRS	\$4.76	\$1.32	\$1.60	\$0.91	\$0.93	-29.5%	\$0.29	\$0.36	\$0.20	\$0.20	-30.7%
CCP ^a	\$1.43	\$0.31	\$0.58	\$0.22	\$0.32	3.2%	\$0.07	\$0.13	\$0.05	\$0.07	1.5%
UASI	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$3.34	\$3.34	na	na	na	na	\$0.75	na	na	na	na
Total	\$130.51	\$42.23	\$41.56	\$28.15	\$18.57	-56.0%	\$9.43	\$9.23	\$6.22	\$4.07	-56.8%
Alaska											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$45.12	\$16.46	\$14.86	\$9.37	\$4.43	-73.1%	\$25.69	\$22.92	\$14.24	\$6.68	-74.0%

CRS-22

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
LETPP	\$11.05	na	\$4.41	\$3.41	\$3.23	-26.8%	\$0.00	\$6.80	\$5.18	\$4.87	-28.4%
EMPG	\$6.09	\$1.45	\$1.53	\$1.53	\$1.58	8.6%	\$2.27	\$2.36	\$2.33	\$2.38	4.8%
MMRS	\$1.80	\$0.88	\$0.00	\$0.46	\$0.46	-47.2%	\$1.37	\$0.00	\$0.69	\$0.70	-49.0%
CCP	\$0.76	\$0.17	\$0.31	\$0.12	\$0.17	2.2%	\$0.26	\$0.48	\$0.18	\$0.26	-1.3%
UASI	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$1.76	\$1.76	na	na	na	na	\$2.75	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$66.59	\$20.73	\$21.11	\$14.88	\$9.87	-52.4%	\$32.35	\$32.55	\$22.62	\$14.88	-54.0%
Arizona											
Population**							5,438,159	5,577,784	5,739,879	5,939,292	9.2%
SHSGP	\$95.05	\$34.88	\$31.49	\$20.02	\$8.66	-75.2%	\$6.41	\$5.65	\$3.49	\$1.46	-77.3%
LETPP	\$22.91	na	\$9.34	\$7.28	\$6.29	-32.7%	\$0.00	\$1.68	\$1.27	\$1.06	-36.8%
EMPG	\$12.90	\$3.08	\$3.24	\$3.24	\$3.35	8.8%	\$0.57	\$0.58	\$0.56	\$0.56	-0.4%
MMRS	\$4.81	\$1.12	\$1.85	\$0.91	\$0.93	-17.0%	\$0.21	\$0.33	\$0.16	\$0.16	-24.0%
CCP	\$1.63	\$0.35	\$0.65	\$0.25	\$0.37	5.8%	\$0.06	\$0.12	\$0.04	\$0.06	-3.1%
UASI											
Phoenix	\$37.15	\$11.03	\$12.20	\$10.00	\$3.92	-64.5%	\$2.03	\$2.19	\$1.74	\$0.66	-67.5%
CIP	\$3.74	\$3.74	na	na	na	na	\$0.69	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$178.19	\$54.20	\$58.77	\$41.70	\$23.52	-56.6%	\$9.97	\$10.54	\$7.27	\$3.96	-60.3%

CRS-23

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)					Per Capita Amount					
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
Arkansas											
Population**							2,706,606	2,726,166	2,750,000	2,779,154	2.7%
SHSGP	\$67.38	\$26.98	\$22.00	\$13.85	\$4.55	-83.1%	\$9.97	\$8.07	\$5.04	\$1.64	-83.6%
LETPP	\$14.88	na	\$6.53	\$5.04	\$3.31	-49.3%	\$0.00	\$2.39	\$1.83	\$1.19	-50.3%
EMPG	\$9.02	\$2.15	\$2.26	\$2.26	\$2.34	8.6%	\$0.80	\$0.83	\$0.82	\$0.84	5.8%
MMRS	\$0.74	\$0.28	\$0.00	\$0.23	\$0.23	-17.0%	\$0.10	\$0.00	\$0.08	\$0.08	-19.2%
CCP	\$1.13	\$0.25	\$0.46	\$0.18	\$0.25	2.1%	\$0.09	\$0.17	\$0.06	\$0.09	-0.6%
UASI	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$2.61	\$2.61	na	na	na	na	\$0.96	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$95.76	\$32.27	\$31.25	\$21.56	\$10.68	-66.9%	\$11.92	\$11.46	\$7.84	\$3.84	-67.8%
California											
Population**							34,988,088	35,456,602	35,842,038	36,132,147	3.3%
SHSGP	\$430.44	\$164.28	\$133.96	\$84.61	\$47.58	-71.0%	\$4.70	\$3.78	\$2.36	\$1.32	-72.0%
LETPP	\$112.89	na	\$39.75	\$30.77	\$42.37	6.6%	\$0.00	\$1.12	\$0.86	\$1.17	4.6%
EMPG	\$54.89	\$13.09	\$13.77	\$13.79	\$14.24	8.7%	\$0.37	\$0.39	\$0.38	\$0.39	5.3%
MMRS	\$21.17	\$6.04	\$6.85	\$4.10	\$4.18	-30.8%	\$0.17	\$0.19	\$0.11	\$0.12	-33.0%
CCP	\$6.88	\$1.49	\$2.78	\$1.07	\$1.53	2.3%	\$0.04	\$0.08	\$0.03	\$0.04	-1.0%
UASI											
Anaheim	\$57.21	\$0.00	\$25.40	\$19.83	\$11.98	-52.8%	\$0.00	\$0.72	\$0.55	\$0.33	-53.7%
Bay Area	\$134.80	\$28.94	\$44.32	\$33.23	\$28.32	-2.1%	\$0.83	\$1.25	\$0.93	\$0.78	-5.2%
Fresno	\$7.08	\$0.00	\$7.08	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.20	\$0.00	\$0.00	na

CRS-24

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
Los Angeles	\$228.02	\$37.76	\$40.40	\$69.24	\$80.61	113.5%	\$1.08	\$1.14	\$1.93	\$2.23	106.7%
Sacramento	\$28.41	\$6.91	\$8.02	\$6.09	\$7.39	6.9%	\$0.20	\$0.23	\$0.17	\$0.20	3.5%
San Diego	\$44.61	\$11.36	\$10.48	\$14.78	\$7.99	-29.7%	\$0.32	\$0.30	\$0.41	\$0.22	-31.9%
CIP	\$15.90	\$15.90	na	na	na	na	\$0.45	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$1,142.30	\$285.78	\$332.83	\$277.50	\$246.19	-13.9%	\$8.17	\$9.39	\$7.74	\$6.81	-16.6%
Colorado											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$88.68	\$34.59	\$28.21	\$17.80	\$8.08	-76.64%	\$7.69	\$6.20	\$3.87	\$1.73	-77.5%
LETPP	\$22.44	na	\$8.37	\$6.47	\$7.60	-9.20%	\$0.00	\$1.84	\$1.41	\$1.63	-11.5%
EMPG	\$11.56	\$2.76	\$2.90	\$2.90	\$3.00	8.61%	\$0.61	\$0.64	\$0.63	\$0.64	4.7%
MMRS	\$3.42	\$0.84	\$1.20	\$0.68	\$0.70	-16.67%	\$0.19	\$0.26	\$0.15	\$0.15	-19.6%
CCP	\$1.45	\$0.31	\$0.59	\$0.23	\$0.32	3.23%	\$0.07	\$0.13	\$0.05	\$0.07	-0.5%
UASI											
Denver	\$37.32	\$15.57	\$8.65	\$8.72	\$4.38	-71.87%	\$3.46	\$1.90	\$1.89	\$0.94	-72.9%
CIP	\$0.00	na	na	na	na	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$164.87	\$54.07	\$49.92	\$36.80	\$24.08	-55.47%	\$12.02	\$10.98	\$8.00	\$5.16	-57.1%
Connecticut											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$81.40	\$30.16	\$24.59	\$15.49	\$11.16	-63.0%	\$8.72	\$7.05	\$4.43	\$3.18	-63.5%
LETPP	\$14.78	na	\$7.30	\$5.63	\$1.85	-74.7%	\$0.00	\$2.09	\$1.61	\$0.53	-74.8%
EMPG	\$10.08	\$2.41	\$2.53	\$2.53	\$2.61	8.4%	\$0.70	\$0.73	\$0.72	\$0.74	6.8%
MMRS	\$1.34	\$0.48	\$0.40	\$0.23	\$0.23	-52.1%	\$0.14	\$0.11	\$0.07	\$0.07	-52.8%

CRS-25

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
CCP	\$1.26	\$0.27	\$0.51	\$0.20	\$0.28	3.7%	\$0.08	\$0.15	\$0.06	\$0.08	2.2%
UASI	\$9.63	\$0.00	\$9.63	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$2.76	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$2.92	\$2.92	na	na	na	na	\$0.84	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$121.41	\$36.24	\$44.96	\$24.08	\$16.13	-55.5%	\$10.48	\$12.90	\$6.88	\$4.60	-56.1%
Delaware											
Population**							805,767	817,827	830,069	843,524	4.7%
SHSGP	\$50.15	\$18.92	\$15.43	\$9.73	\$6.07	-67.9%	\$23.48	\$18.87	\$11.72	\$7.20	-69.4%
LETPP	\$12.17	na	\$4.58	\$3.54	\$4.05	-11.6%	\$0.00	\$5.60	\$4.26	\$4.80	-14.3%
EMPG	\$6.33	\$1.51	\$1.59	\$1.59	\$1.64	8.6%	\$1.87	\$1.94	\$1.92	\$1.94	3.7%
MMRS	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CCP	\$0.79	\$0.17	\$0.32	\$0.12	\$0.18	5.9%	\$0.21	\$0.39	\$0.14	\$0.21	1.1%
UASI	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$1.83	\$1.83	na	na	na	na	\$2.27	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$71.27	\$22.43	\$21.92	\$14.98	\$11.94	-46.8%	\$27.84	\$26.80	\$18.05	\$14.15	-49.2%
D.C.											
Population**							564,624	557,846	554,239	550,521	-2.5%
SHSGP	\$45.98	\$17.92	\$14.61	\$9.18	\$4.27	-76.2%	\$31.74	\$26.19	\$16.56	\$7.76	-75.6%
LETPP	\$10.79	na	\$4.34	\$3.34	\$3.11	-28.3%	\$0.00	\$7.78	\$6.03	\$5.65	-27.4%
EMPG	\$5.98	\$1.43	\$1.50	\$1.50	\$1.55	8.6%	\$2.53	\$2.69	\$2.71	\$2.82	11.3%

CRS-26

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
MMRS	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CCP	\$0.75	\$0.16	\$0.30	\$0.12	\$0.17	6.3%	\$0.28	\$0.54	\$0.22	\$0.31	9.0%
UASI											
N.C.R. ^b	\$218.26	\$60.49	\$29.30	\$82.00	\$46.47	-23.2%	\$107.13	\$52.52	\$147.95	\$84.41	-21.2%
CIP	\$1.73	\$1.73	na	na	na	na	\$3.06	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$283.49	\$81.73	\$50.05	\$96.14	\$55.57	-32.0%	\$144.75	\$89.72	\$173.46	\$100.95	-30.3%
Florida											
Population**							16,677,860	16,993,369	17,385,430	17,789,864	6.7%
SHSGP	\$227.01	\$86.31	\$70.38	\$44.73	\$25.59	-70.4%	\$19.27	\$15.63	\$9.88	\$5.61	-70.9%
LETPP	\$55.76	na	\$20.89	\$16.26	\$18.61	-10.9%	na	\$4.64	\$3.59	\$4.08	-12.0%
EMPG	\$28.82	\$6.87	\$7.23	\$7.24	\$7.48	8.9%	\$1.53	\$1.61	\$1.60	\$1.64	7.0%
MMRS	\$7.97	\$2.36	\$2.39	\$1.59	\$1.63	-30.9%	\$0.53	\$0.53	\$0.35	\$0.36	-32.1%
CCP	\$3.65	\$0.79	\$1.46	\$0.57	\$0.83	5.1%	\$0.18	\$0.32	\$0.13	\$0.18	3.3%
UASI											
Ft. Lauderdale	\$9.98	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9.98	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.56	na
Jacksonville	\$16.15	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$6.88	\$9.27	34.7%	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.40	\$0.52	31.7%
Miami	\$64.14	\$13.18	\$19.15	\$15.83	\$15.98	21.2%	\$0.79	\$1.13	\$0.91	\$0.90	13.7%
Orlando	\$18.21	\$0.00	\$8.77	\$0.00	\$9.44	7.6%	\$0.00	\$0.52	\$0.00	\$0.53	2.8%
Tampa	\$31.62	\$5.77	\$9.28	\$7.77	\$8.80	52.5%	\$0.35	\$0.55	\$0.45	\$0.49	43.0%
CIP	\$8.35	\$8.35	na	na	na	na	\$0.50	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$471.66	\$123.63	\$139.55	\$100.87	\$107.61	-13.0%	\$7.41	\$8.21	\$5.80	\$6.05	-18.4%

CRS-27

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)					Per Capita Amount					
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
Georgia											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$134.07	\$51.77	\$42.21	\$26.73	\$13.36	-74.2%	\$6.03	\$4.83	\$3.00	\$1.47	-75.6%
LETPP	\$33.68	na	\$12.53	\$9.72	\$11.43	-8.8%	\$0.00	\$1.43	\$1.09	\$1.26	-12.1%
EMPG	\$17.30	\$4.12	\$4.34	\$4.35	\$4.49	8.9%	\$0.48	\$0.50	\$0.49	\$0.49	3.0%
MMRS	\$2.02	\$0.60	\$0.50	\$0.46	\$0.46	-23.3%	\$0.07	\$0.06	\$0.05	\$0.05	-27.5%
CCP	\$2.18	\$0.47	\$0.88	\$0.34	\$0.49	4.3%	\$0.05	\$0.10	\$0.04	\$0.05	-1.4%
UASI											
Atlanta	\$42.73	\$0.00	\$10.74	\$13.33	\$18.66	73.7%	\$0.00	\$1.23	\$1.49	\$2.06	67.5%
CIP	\$5.01	\$5.01	na	na	na	na	\$0.58	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$236.99	\$61.97	\$71.20	\$54.93	\$48.89	-21.1%	\$7.22	\$8.14	\$6.16	\$5.39	-25.4%
Hawaii											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$52.88	\$20.77	\$16.94	\$10.68	\$4.49	-78.4%	\$16.83	\$13.57	\$8.46	\$3.52	-79.1%
LETPP	\$12.17	na	\$5.03	\$3.88	\$3.26	-35.2%	\$0.00	\$4.03	\$3.07	\$2.56	-36.6%
EMPG	\$6.94	\$1.66	\$1.74	\$1.74	\$1.80	8.4%	\$1.34	\$1.39	\$1.38	\$1.41	5.0%
MMRS	\$1.14	\$0.28	\$0.40	\$0.23	\$0.23	-17.9%	\$0.23	\$0.32	\$0.18	\$0.18	-20.5%

CRS-28

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
CCP	\$0.87	\$0.19	\$0.35	\$0.14	\$0.19	0.0%	\$0.15	\$0.28	\$0.11	\$0.15	-3.2%
UASI											
Honolulu	\$18.08	\$6.87	\$0.00	\$6.45	\$4.76	-30.7%	\$5.57	\$0.00	\$5.11	\$3.73	-32.9%
CIP	\$2.01	\$2.01	na	na	na	na	\$1.63	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$94.09	\$31.78	\$24.46	\$23.12	\$14.73	-53.7%	\$25.75	\$19.60	\$18.32	\$11.55	-55.1%
Idaho											
Population**							1,343,973	1,368,111	1,395,140	1,429,096	6.3%
SHSGP	\$56.06	\$21.18	\$17.27	\$10.92	\$6.69	-68.4%	\$15.76	\$12.62	\$7.83	\$4.68	-70.3%
LETPP	\$13.97	na	\$5.13	\$3.97	\$4.87	-5.1%	\$0.00	\$3.75	\$2.85	\$3.41	-9.1%
EMPG	\$7.09	\$1.69	\$1.78	\$1.78	\$1.84	8.6%	\$1.26	\$1.30	\$1.28	\$1.28	2.1%
MMRS	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CCP	\$0.89	\$0.19	\$0.36	\$0.14	\$0.20	5.3%	\$0.14	\$0.26	\$0.10	\$0.14	-1.0%
UASI	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$2.05	\$2.05	na	na	na	na	\$1.53	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$80.06	\$25.11	\$24.54	\$16.81	\$13.60	-45.9%	\$18.68	\$17.94	\$12.05	\$9.51	-49.1%

CRS-29

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)					Per Capita Amount					
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
Illinois											
Population**							12,586,839	12,649,940	12,712,016	12,763,371	1.4%
SHSGP	\$179.43	\$68.88	\$56.17	\$35.30	\$19.08	-72.3%	\$5.47	\$4.44	\$2.78	\$1.49	-72.7%
LETPP	\$47.71	na	\$16.67	\$12.84	\$18.20	9.2%	\$0.00	\$1.32	\$1.01	\$1.43	8.2%
EMPG	\$23.00	\$5.48	\$5.77	\$5.78	\$5.97	8.9%	\$0.44	\$0.46	\$0.45	\$0.47	7.4%
MMRS	\$1.14	\$0.28	\$0.40	\$0.23	\$0.23	-17.9%	\$0.02	\$0.03	\$0.02	\$0.02	-19.0%
CCP	\$2.88	\$0.63	\$1.17	\$0.45	\$0.63	0.0%	\$0.05	\$0.09	\$0.04	\$0.05	-1.4%
UASI											
Chicago	\$175.27	\$40.87	\$34.14	\$48.00	\$52.26	27.9%	\$3.25	\$2.70	\$3.78	\$4.09	26.1%
CIP	\$6.67	\$6.67	na	na	na	na	\$0.53	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$436.10	\$122.81	\$114.32	\$102.60	\$96.37	-21.5%	\$9.76	\$9.04	\$8.07	\$7.55	-22.6%
Indiana											
Population**							6,154,739	6,196,269	6,226,537	6,271,973	1.9%
SHSGP	\$107.68	\$41.59	\$33.92	\$21.35	\$10.82	-74.0%	\$6.76	\$5.47	\$3.43	\$1.73	-74.5%
LETPP	\$22.92	na	\$10.07	\$7.76	\$5.09	-49.5%	\$0.00	\$1.63	\$1.25	\$0.81	-50.1%
EMPG	\$13.89	\$3.31	\$3.49	\$3.49	\$3.60	8.9%	\$0.54	\$0.56	\$0.56	\$0.57	6.9%
MMRS	\$2.48	\$0.76	\$0.80	\$0.46	\$0.46	-39.5%	\$0.12	\$0.13	\$0.07	\$0.07	-40.6%

CRS-30

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
CCP	\$1.73	\$0.38	\$0.70	\$0.27	\$0.38	0.0%	\$0.06	\$0.11	\$0.04	\$0.06	-1.9%
UASI											
Indianapolis	\$20.18	\$0.00	\$10.15	\$5.66	\$4.37	-56.9%	\$0.00	\$1.64	\$0.91	\$0.70	-57.5%
CIP	\$4.03	\$4.03	na	na	na	na	\$0.65	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$106.82	\$50.07	\$25.21	\$17.64	\$13.90	-72.2%	\$8.14	\$4.07	\$2.83	\$2.22	-72.7%
Iowa											
Population**							2,934,340	2,941,362	2,952,904	2,966,334	1.1%
SHSGP	\$72.57	\$27.94	\$22.78	\$14.33	\$7.52	-73.1%	\$9.52	\$7.74	\$4.85	\$2.54	-73.4%
LETPP	\$17.44	na	\$6.76	\$5.21	\$5.47	-19.1%	\$0.00	\$2.30	\$1.76	\$1.84	-19.8%
EMPG	\$9.34	\$2.23	\$2.34	\$2.35	\$2.42	8.6%	\$0.76	\$0.80	\$0.80	\$0.82	7.4%
MMRS	\$0.74	\$0.28	\$0.00	\$0.23	\$0.23	-17.9%	\$0.10	\$0.00	\$0.08	\$0.08	-18.7%
CCP	\$1.16	\$0.25	\$0.47	\$0.18	\$0.26	4.0%	\$0.09	\$0.16	\$0.06	\$0.09	2.9%
UASI	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$2.70	\$2.70	na	na	na	na	\$0.92	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$103.95	\$33.40	\$32.35	\$22.30	\$15.90	-52.4%	\$11.38	\$11.00	\$7.55	\$5.36	-52.9%

CRS-31

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)					Per Capita Amount					
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
Kansas											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$70.72	\$27.00	\$22.02	\$13.85	\$7.85	-70.9%	\$9.95	\$8.08	\$5.07	\$2.86	-71.3%
LETPP	\$17.28	na	\$6.53	\$5.04	\$5.71	-12.6%	\$0.00	\$2.40	\$1.84	\$2.08	-13.2%
EMPG	\$9.02	\$2.15	\$2.26	\$2.27	\$2.34	8.8%	\$0.79	\$0.83	\$0.83	\$0.85	7.6%
MMRS	\$2.36	\$0.76	\$0.68	\$0.46	\$0.46	-39.5%	\$0.28	\$0.25	\$0.17	\$0.17	-40.2%
CCP	\$1.14	\$0.25	\$0.46	\$0.18	\$0.25	0.0%	\$0.09	\$0.17	\$0.07	\$0.09	-1.2%
UASI	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$2.61	\$2.61	na	na	na	na	\$0.96	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$103.13	\$32.77	\$31.95	\$21.80	\$16.61	-49.3%	\$12.08	\$11.73	\$7.97	\$6.05	-49.9%
Kentucky											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$86.99	\$32.84	\$26.78	\$16.86	\$10.51	-68.0%	\$8.03	\$6.51	\$4.07	\$2.52	-68.6%
LETPP	\$18.40	na	\$7.95	\$6.13	\$4.32	-45.7%	\$0.00	\$1.93	\$1.48	\$1.04	-46.4%
EMPG	\$10.98	\$2.62	\$2.75	\$2.76	\$2.85	8.6%	\$0.64	\$0.67	\$0.67	\$0.68	6.4%
MMRS	\$1.85	\$0.28	\$0.65	\$0.46	\$0.46	64.3%	\$0.07	\$0.16	\$0.11	\$0.11	60.9%
CCP	\$1.37	\$0.30	\$0.56	\$0.21	\$0.30	0.0%	\$0.07	\$0.14	\$0.05	\$0.07	-2.0%

CRS-32

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
UASI											
Louisville	\$22.51	\$0.00	\$8.99	\$5.00	\$8.52	-5.2%	\$0.00	\$2.18	\$1.21	\$2.04	-6.5%
CIP	\$3.18	\$3.18	na	na	na	na	\$0.78	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$145.28	\$39.22	\$47.68	\$31.42	\$26.96	-31.3%	\$9.59	\$11.58	\$7.59	\$6.46	-32.7%
Louisiana											
Population**							4,475,003	4,490,380	4,506,685	4,523,628	1.1%
SHSGP	\$92.32	\$34.49	\$28.13	\$17.68	\$12.02	-65.1%	\$7.71	\$6.26	\$3.92	\$2.66	-65.5%
LETPP	\$23.52	na	\$8.35	\$6.43	\$8.74	4.7%	\$0.00	\$1.86	\$1.43	\$1.93	3.9%
EMPG	\$11.53	\$2.75	\$2.89	\$2.90	\$2.99	8.7%	\$0.61	\$0.64	\$0.64	\$0.66	7.5%
MMRS	\$4.60	\$1.32	\$1.44	\$0.91	\$0.93	-29.5%	\$0.30	\$0.32	\$0.20	\$0.21	-30.3%
CCP	\$1.43	\$0.31	\$0.58	\$0.22	\$0.32	3.2%	\$0.07	\$0.13	\$0.05	\$0.07	2.1%
UASI											
Baton Rouge	\$16.16	\$0.00	\$7.19	\$5.23	\$3.74	-48.0%	\$0.00	\$1.60	\$1.16	\$0.83	-48.4%
New Orleans	\$21.15	\$0.00	\$7.15	\$9.31	\$4.69	-34.4%	\$0.00	\$1.59	\$2.07	\$1.04	-34.9%
CIP	\$3.34	\$3.34	na	na	na	na	\$0.75	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$174.04	\$42.21	\$55.73	\$42.68	\$33.43	-20.8%	\$9.43	\$12.41	\$9.47	\$7.39	-21.7%

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)					Per Capita Amount					
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
Maine											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$53.27	\$20.98	\$17.11	\$10.79	\$4.39	-79.1%	\$16.18	\$13.08	\$8.21	\$3.32	-79.5%
LETPP	\$12.20	na	\$5.08	\$3.92	\$3.20	-37.0%	\$0.00	\$3.88	\$2.98	\$2.42	-37.6%
EMPG	\$7.01	\$1.67	\$1.76	\$1.76	\$1.82	8.9%	\$1.29	\$1.35	\$1.34	\$1.38	6.9%
MMRS	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CCP	\$0.88	\$0.19	\$0.36	\$0.14	\$0.19	0.0%	\$0.15	\$0.28	\$0.11	\$0.14	-1.9%
UASI	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$2.03	\$2.03	na	na	na	na	\$1.57	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$75.39	\$24.87	\$24.31	\$16.61	\$9.60	-61.4%	\$19.18	\$18.58	\$12.63	\$7.26	-62.1%
Maryland											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$98.11	\$38.62	\$31.50	\$19.87	\$8.12	-79.0%	\$7.10	\$5.71	\$3.57	\$1.45	-79.6%
LETPP	\$22.48	na	\$9.35	\$7.22	\$5.91	-36.8%	\$0.00	\$1.70	\$1.30	\$1.06	-37.8%
EMPG	\$12.91	\$3.08	\$3.24	\$3.24	\$3.35	8.7%	\$0.57	\$0.59	\$0.58	\$0.60	5.6%
MMRS	\$1.20	\$0.28	\$0.46	\$0.23	\$0.23	-17.9%	\$0.05	\$0.08	\$0.04	\$0.04	-20.2%
CCP	\$1.61	\$0.35	\$0.65	\$0.25	\$0.36	2.9%	\$0.06	\$0.12	\$0.05	\$0.06	0.0%

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
UASI											
Baltimore	\$47.93	\$10.90	\$15.92	\$11.44	\$9.67	-11.3%	\$2.00	\$2.89	\$2.06	\$1.73	-13.8%
CIP	\$3.74	\$3.74	na	na	na	na	\$0.69	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$187.98	\$56.97	\$61.12	\$42.25	\$27.64	-51.5%	\$10.47	\$11.09	\$7.60	\$4.93	-52.9%
Massachusetts											
Population**							6,411,568	6,417,565	6,407,382	6,398,743	-0.2%
SHSGP	\$111.15	\$42.73	\$34.85	\$21.86	\$11.71	-72.6%	\$6.66	\$5.43	\$3.41	\$1.83	-72.5%
LETPP	\$28.53	na	\$10.34	\$7.95	\$10.24	-1.0%	\$0.00	\$1.61	\$1.24	\$1.60	-0.7%
EMPG	\$14.28	\$3.41	\$3.58	\$3.59	\$3.70	8.6%	\$0.53	\$0.56	\$0.56	\$0.58	8.8%
MMRS	\$3.77	\$1.24	\$1.15	\$0.68	\$0.70	-43.5%	\$0.19	\$0.18	\$0.11	\$0.11	-43.4%
CCP	\$1.78	\$0.39	\$0.72	\$0.28	\$0.39	0.0%	\$0.06	\$0.11	\$0.04	\$0.06	0.2%
UASI											
Boston	\$82.15	\$16.73	\$19.13	\$28.08	\$18.21	8.8%	\$2.61	\$2.98	\$4.38	\$2.85	9.1%
CIP	\$4.14	\$4.14	na	na	na	na	\$0.65	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$245.80	\$68.64	\$69.77	\$62.44	\$44.95	-34.5%	\$10.71	\$10.87	\$9.75	\$7.03	-34.4%

CRS-35

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)					Per Capita Amount					
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
Michigan											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$150.83	\$58.08	\$47.36	\$29.74	\$15.65	-73.1%	\$5.79	\$4.70	\$2.94	\$1.55	-73.3%
LETPP	\$36.25	na	\$14.05	\$10.81	\$11.39	-18.9%	\$0.00	\$1.39	\$1.07	\$1.13	-19.3%
EMPG	\$19.41	\$4.63	\$4.87	\$4.88	\$5.03	8.7%	\$0.46	\$0.48	\$0.48	\$0.50	7.8%
MMRS	\$3.07	\$1.04	\$0.65	\$0.68	\$0.70	-32.7%	\$0.10	\$0.06	\$0.07	\$0.07	-33.2%
CCP	\$2.42	\$0.53	\$0.98	\$0.38	\$0.53	0.0%	\$0.05	\$0.10	\$0.04	\$0.05	-0.8%
UASI											
Detroit	\$62.23	\$12.27	\$13.75	\$17.58	\$18.63	51.8%	\$1.22	\$1.36	\$1.74	\$1.84	50.6%
CIP	\$5.62	\$5.62	na	na	na	na	\$0.56	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$279.83	\$82.17	\$81.66	\$64.07	\$51.93	-36.8%	\$8.18	\$8.10	\$6.34	\$5.13	-37.3%
Minnesota											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$90.44	\$36.77	\$29.98	\$18.90	\$4.79	-87.0%	\$7.32	\$5.92	\$3.71	\$0.93	-87.3%
LETPP	\$19.26	na	\$8.90	\$6.87	\$3.49	-60.8%	\$0.00	\$1.76	\$1.35	\$0.68	-61.3%
EMPG	\$12.29	\$2.93	\$3.08	\$3.09	\$3.19	8.7%	\$0.58	\$0.61	\$0.61	\$0.62	6.4%
MMRS	\$2.28	\$0.56	\$0.80	\$0.46	\$0.46	-17.9%	\$0.11	\$0.16	\$0.09	\$0.09	-19.6%

CRS-36

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
CCP	\$1.53	\$0.33	\$0.62	\$0.24	\$0.34	3.0%	\$0.07	\$0.12	\$0.05	\$0.07	0.8%
UASI											
Minneapolis	\$30.18	\$0.00	\$20.11	\$5.76	\$4.31	-78.6%	\$0.00	\$3.97	\$1.13	\$0.84	-78.9%
CIP	\$3.56	\$3.56	na	na	na	na	\$0.71	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$159.54	\$44.15	\$63.49	\$35.32	\$16.58	-62.5%	\$8.79	\$12.54	\$6.93	\$3.23	-63.3%
Mississippi											
Population**							2,866,349	2,880,793	2,900,768	2,921,088	1.9%
SHSGP	\$69.07	\$27.67	\$22.56	\$14.19	\$4.65	-83.2%	\$9.65	\$7.83	\$4.89	\$1.59	-83.5%
LETPP	\$15.24	na	\$6.69	\$5.16	\$3.39	-49.3%	\$0.00	\$2.32	\$1.78	\$1.16	-50.0%
EMPG	\$9.25	\$2.21	\$2.32	\$2.32	\$2.40	8.5%	\$0.77	\$0.81	\$0.80	\$0.82	6.4%
MMRS	\$1.14	\$0.28	\$0.40	\$0.23	\$0.23	-17.9%	\$0.10	\$0.14	\$0.08	\$0.08	-19.4%
CCP	\$1.16	\$0.25	\$0.47	\$0.18	\$0.26	4.0%	\$0.09	\$0.16	\$0.06	\$0.09	2.1%
UASI	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$2.68	\$2.68	na	na	na	na	\$0.94	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$98.54	\$33.09	\$32.44	\$22.08	\$10.93	-67.0%	\$11.54	\$11.26	\$7.61	\$3.74	-67.6%

CRS-37

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)					Per Capita Amount					
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
Missouri											
Population**							5,681,045	5,718,717	5,759,532	5,800,310	2.1%
SHSGP	\$110.04	\$39.53	\$32.24	\$20.29	\$17.98	-54.5%	\$6.96	\$5.64	\$3.52	\$3.10	-55.5%
LETPP	\$22.56	na	\$9.57	\$7.38	\$5.61	-41.4%	\$0.00	\$1.67	\$1.28	\$0.97	-42.2%
EMPG	\$13.21	\$3.15	\$3.31	\$3.32	\$3.43	8.8%	\$0.55	\$0.58	\$0.58	\$0.59	6.5%
MMRS	\$2.53	\$0.56	\$1.05	\$0.46	\$0.46	-17.9%	\$0.10	\$0.18	\$0.08	\$0.08	-19.5%
CCP	\$1.66	\$0.36	\$0.67	\$0.26	\$0.37	2.8%	\$0.06	\$0.12	\$0.05	\$0.06	0.7%
UASI											
Kansas City	\$40.45	\$9.70	\$13.30	\$8.21	\$9.24	-4.7%	\$1.71	\$2.33	\$1.43	\$1.59	-6.7%
St. Louis	\$36.88	\$9.85	\$10.79	\$7.04	\$9.20	-6.6%	\$1.73	\$1.89	\$1.22	\$1.59	-8.5%
CIP	\$3.83	\$3.83	na	na	na	na	\$0.67	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$231.16	\$66.98	\$70.93	\$46.96	\$46.29	-30.9%	\$11.79	\$12.40	\$8.15	\$7.98	-32.3%
Montana											
Population**							910,395	917,885	926,920	935,670	2.8%
SHSGP	\$49.57	\$19.35	\$15.78	\$9.95	\$4.49	-76.8%	\$21.25	\$17.19	\$10.73	\$4.80	-77.4%
LETPP	\$11.56	na	\$4.68	\$3.62	\$3.26	-30.3%	\$0.00	\$5.10	\$3.91	\$3.48	-31.7%
EMPG	\$6.46	\$1.54	\$1.62	\$1.62	\$1.68	8.9%	\$1.69	\$1.76	\$1.75	\$1.79	5.9%

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
MMRS	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CCP	\$0.82	\$0.18	\$0.33	\$0.13	\$0.18	0.0%	\$0.20	\$0.36	\$0.14	\$0.19	-2.7%
UASI	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$1.87	\$1.87	na	na	na	na	\$2.05	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$70.28	\$22.94	\$22.41	\$15.32	\$9.61	-58.1%	\$25.20	\$24.41	\$16.53	\$10.27	-59.3%
Nebraska											
Population**							1,726,753	1,738,013	1,747,704	1,758,787	1.9%
SHSGP	\$64.35	\$22.82	\$18.61	\$11.72	\$11.20	-50.9%	\$13.22	\$10.71	\$6.71	\$6.37	-51.8%
LETPP	\$11.32	na	\$5.52	\$4.26	\$1.54	-72.1%	\$0.00	\$3.18	\$2.44	\$0.88	-72.4%
EMPG	\$7.63	\$1.82	\$1.91	\$1.92	\$1.98	8.7%	\$1.05	\$1.10	\$1.10	\$1.12	6.7%
MMRS	\$1.98	\$0.56	\$0.50	\$0.46	\$0.46	-17.9%	\$0.32	\$0.29	\$0.26	\$0.26	-19.4%
CCP	\$0.96	\$0.21	\$0.39	\$0.15	\$0.21	0.0%	\$0.12	\$0.22	\$0.09	\$0.12	-1.8%
UASI											
Omaha	\$13.48	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5.15	\$8.33	61.7%	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2.95	\$4.74	60.7%
CIP	\$2.21	\$2.21	na	na	na	na	\$1.28	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$101.93	\$27.62	\$26.93	\$23.66	\$23.72	-14.1%	\$16.00	\$15.49	\$13.54	\$13.49	-15.7%

CRS-39

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)					Per Capita Amount					
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
Nevada											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$65.78	\$24.71	\$20.15	\$12.81	\$8.11	-67.2%	\$11.40	\$8.99	\$5.49	\$3.36	-70.5%
LETPP	\$14.82	na	\$5.98	\$4.66	\$4.18	-30.1%	\$0.00	\$2.67	\$2.00	\$1.73	-35.1%
EMPG	\$8.25	\$1.97	\$2.07	\$2.07	\$2.14	8.7%	\$0.91	\$0.92	\$0.89	\$0.89	-2.4%
MMRS	\$1.14	\$0.28	\$0.40	\$0.23	\$0.23	-17.9%	\$0.13	\$0.18	\$0.10	\$0.10	-26.3%
CCP	\$1.04	\$0.22	\$0.42	\$0.16	\$0.24	9.1%	\$0.10	\$0.19	\$0.07	\$0.10	-2.1%
UASI											
Las Vegas	\$26.74	\$0.00	\$10.53	\$8.46	\$7.75	-26.4%	\$0.00	\$4.70	\$3.63	\$3.21	-31.7%
CIP	\$2.39	\$2.39	na	na	na	na	\$1.10	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$120.16	\$29.57	\$39.55	\$28.39	\$22.65	-23.4%	\$13.64	\$17.64	\$12.17	\$9.38	-31.2%
New Hampshire											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$53.01	\$20.90	\$17.04	\$10.75	\$4.32	-79.3%	\$16.40	\$13.23	\$8.27	\$3.30	-79.9%
LETPP	\$12.11	na	\$5.06	\$3.91	\$3.14	-37.9%	\$0.00	\$3.93	\$3.01	\$2.40	-39.0%
EMPG	\$6.98	\$1.67	\$1.75	\$1.75	\$1.81	8.5%	\$1.31	\$1.36	\$1.35	\$1.38	5.5%
MMRS	\$1.46	\$0.60	\$0.40	\$0.23	\$0.23	-61.7%	\$0.47	\$0.31	\$0.18	\$0.18	-62.7%

CRS-40

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
CCP	\$0.87	\$0.19	\$0.35	\$0.14	\$0.19	0.0%	\$0.15	\$0.27	\$0.11	\$0.15	-2.7%
UASI	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$2.02	\$2.02	na	na	na	na	\$1.58	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$76.45	\$25.38	\$24.60	\$16.78	\$9.69	-61.8%	\$19.91	\$19.11	\$12.92	\$7.40	-62.8%
New Jersey											
Population**							8,576,089	8,640,028	8,685,166	8,717,925	1.7%
SHSGP	\$130.01	\$51.89	\$42.32	\$26.63	\$9.17	-82.3%	\$6.05	\$4.90	\$3.07	\$1.05	-82.6%
LETPP	\$29.78	na	\$12.56	\$9.68	\$7.54	-40.0%	\$0.00	\$1.45	\$1.11	\$0.86	-40.5%
EMPG	\$17.35	\$4.14	\$4.35	\$4.36	\$4.50	8.6%	\$0.48	\$0.50	\$0.50	\$0.52	6.9%
MMRS	\$2.13	\$0.56	\$0.65	\$0.46	\$0.46	-17.9%	\$0.07	\$0.08	\$0.05	\$0.05	-19.2%
CCP	\$2.17	\$0.47	\$0.88	\$0.34	\$0.48	2.1%	\$0.05	\$0.10	\$0.04	\$0.06	0.5%
UASI											
Jersey City	\$97.56	\$11.89	\$32.17	\$19.17	\$34.33	188.7%	\$1.39	\$3.72	\$2.21	\$3.94	184.0%
CIP	\$5.02	\$5.02	na	na	na	na	\$0.59	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$284.02	\$73.97	\$92.93	\$60.64	\$56.48	-23.6%	\$8.63	\$10.76	\$6.98	\$6.48	-24.9%

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
New Mexico											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$58.96	\$23.36	\$19.05	\$12.02	\$4.53	-80.6%	\$12.59	\$10.14	\$6.32	\$2.35	-81.3%
LETPP	\$13.31	na	\$5.65	\$4.37	\$3.29	-41.8%	\$0.00	\$3.01	\$2.30	\$1.71	-43.3%
EMPG	\$7.80	\$1.86	\$1.96	\$1.96	\$2.02	8.8%	\$1.00	\$1.04	\$1.03	\$1.05	4.7%
MMRS	\$0.91	\$0.28	\$0.40	\$0.00	\$0.23	-17.9%	\$0.15	\$0.21	\$0.00	\$0.12	-21.0%
CCP	\$0.98	\$0.21	\$0.40	\$0.15	\$0.22	4.8%	\$0.11	\$0.21	\$0.08	\$0.11	0.8%
UASI	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$2.26	\$2.26	na	na	na	na	\$1.22	na	na	na	na
Total	\$84.22	\$27.97	\$27.46	\$18.50	\$10.29	-63.2%	\$15.07	\$14.61	\$9.72	\$5.34	-64.6%
New York											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$252.37	\$96.66	\$78.83	\$49.42	\$27.46	-71.6%	\$5.04	\$4.10	\$2.56	\$1.43	-71.7%
LETPP	\$67.37	na	\$23.39	\$17.97	\$26.01	11.2%	\$0.00	\$1.22	\$0.93	\$1.35	11.0%
EMPG	\$32.29	\$7.70	\$8.10	\$8.11	\$8.38	8.8%	\$0.40	\$0.42	\$0.42	\$0.44	8.3%
MMRS	\$6.79	\$1.60	\$2.89	\$1.14	\$1.16	-27.5%	\$0.08	\$0.15	\$0.06	\$0.06	-27.8%
CCP	\$4.03	\$0.88	\$1.64	\$0.63	\$0.88	0.0%	\$0.05	\$0.09	\$0.03	\$0.05	-0.5%

CRS-42

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
UASI											
Buffalo	\$31.29	\$10.27	\$10.10	\$7.21	\$3.71	-63.9%	\$0.54	\$0.53	\$0.37	\$0.19	-64.0%
New York	\$528.79	\$149.77	\$47.01	\$207.56	\$124.45	-16.9%	\$7.81	\$2.44	\$10.77	\$6.46	-17.3%
CIP	\$9.36	\$9.36	na	na	na	na	\$0.49	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$932.29	\$276.24	\$171.96	\$292.04	\$192.05	-30.5%	\$14.41	\$8.94	\$15.15	\$9.97	-30.8%
North Carolina											
Population**							8,312,755	8,422,375	8,540,468	8,683,242	4.5%
SHSGP	\$129.04	\$50.75	\$41.38	\$26.13	\$10.78	-78.8%	\$6.11	\$4.91	\$3.06	\$1.24	-79.7%
LETPP	\$31.34	na	\$12.28	\$9.50	\$9.56	-22.2%	\$0.00	\$1.46	\$1.11	\$1.10	-24.5%
EMPG	\$16.96	\$4.05	\$4.25	\$4.26	\$4.40	8.6%	\$0.49	\$0.50	\$0.50	\$0.51	4.0%
MMRS	\$5.43	\$2.62	\$1.20	\$0.91	\$0.70	-73.3%	\$0.32	\$0.14	\$0.11	\$0.08	-74.4%
CCP	\$2.13	\$0.46	\$0.86	\$0.33	\$0.48	4.3%	\$0.06	\$0.10	\$0.04	\$0.06	-0.1%
UASI											
Charlotte	\$21.85	\$0.00	\$7.40	\$5.48	\$8.97	21.2%	\$0.00	\$0.88	\$0.64	\$1.03	17.6%
CIP	\$4.91	\$4.91	na	na	na	na	\$0.59	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$211.66	\$62.79	\$67.37	\$46.61	\$34.89	-44.4%	\$7.55	\$8.00	\$5.46	\$4.02	-46.8%

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)					Per Capita Amount					
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
North Dakota											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$48.62	\$18.18	\$14.83	\$9.34	\$6.27	-65.5%	\$28.69	\$23.43	\$14.68	\$9.85	-65.7%
LETPP	\$12.14	na	\$4.40	\$3.39	\$4.35	-1.1%	\$0.00	\$6.95	\$5.33	\$6.83	-1.7%
EMPG	\$6.08	\$1.45	\$1.52	\$1.53	\$1.58	8.7%	\$2.29	\$2.40	\$2.40	\$2.48	8.1%
MMRS	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CCP	\$0.77	\$0.17	\$0.31	\$0.12	\$0.17	0.0%	\$0.27	\$0.49	\$0.19	\$0.27	-0.5%
UASI	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$1.76	\$1.76	na	na	na	na	\$2.78	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$69.37	\$21.56	\$21.06	\$14.38	\$12.37	-42.6%	\$34.03	\$33.27	\$22.60	\$19.42	-42.9%
Ohio											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$161.29	\$63.89	\$52.10	\$32.67	\$12.63	-80.2%	\$5.60	\$4.56	\$2.85	\$1.10	-80.3%
LETPP	\$36.52	na	\$15.46	\$11.88	\$9.18	-40.6%	\$0.00	\$1.35	\$1.04	\$0.80	-40.8%
EMPG	\$21.36	\$5.10	\$5.36	\$5.36	\$5.54	8.6%	\$0.45	\$0.47	\$0.47	\$0.48	8.0%
MMRS	\$6.75	\$1.68	\$2.31	\$1.37	\$1.39	-17.3%	\$0.15	\$0.20	\$0.12	\$0.12	-17.7%
CCP	\$2.65	\$0.58	\$1.08	\$0.41	\$0.58	0.0%	\$0.05	\$0.09	\$0.04	\$0.05	-0.5%
UASI											
Cincinnati	\$31.27	\$7.99	\$12.75	\$5.87	\$4.66	-41.7%	\$0.70	\$1.12	\$0.51	\$0.41	-42.0%
Cleveland	\$28.45	\$5.87	\$10.46	\$7.39	\$4.73	-19.4%	\$0.51	\$0.92	\$0.65	\$0.41	-19.8%

CRS-44

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
Columbus	\$20.60	\$0.00	\$8.71	\$7.57	\$4.32	-50.4%	\$0.00	\$0.76	\$0.66	\$0.38	-50.5%
Toledo	\$9.16	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5.31	\$3.85	-27.5%	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.46	\$0.34	-27.6%
CIP	\$6.18	\$6.18	na	na	na	na	\$0.54	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$324.23	\$91.29	\$108.23	\$77.83	\$46.88	-48.7%	\$8.00	\$9.47	\$6.80	\$4.09	-48.9%
Oklahoma											
Population**							3,487,076	3,504,917	3,523,546	3,547,884	1.7%
SHSGP	\$79.04	\$30.30	\$24.71	\$15.55	\$8.48	-72.0%	\$8.69	\$7.05	\$4.41	\$2.39	-72.5%
LETPP	\$19.16	na	\$7.33	\$5.66	\$6.17	-15.8%	\$0.00	\$2.09	\$1.61	\$1.74	-16.8%
EMPG	\$10.13	\$2.42	\$2.54	\$2.54	\$2.63	8.5%	\$0.69	\$0.72	\$0.72	\$0.74	6.6%
MMRS	\$2.90	\$0.56	\$1.42	\$0.46	\$0.46	-17.9%	\$0.16	\$0.40	\$0.13	\$0.13	-19.3%
CCP	\$1.27	\$0.28	\$0.51	\$0.20	\$0.28	0.0%	\$0.08	\$0.15	\$0.06	\$0.08	-1.7%
UASI											
Ok. City	\$9.67	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5.57	\$4.10	-26.4%	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1.58	\$1.16	-26.9%
CIP	\$2.93	\$2.93	na	na	na	na	\$0.84	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$125.09	\$36.49	\$36.51	\$29.98	\$22.12	-39.4%	\$10.46	\$10.42	\$8.51	\$6.23	-40.4%

CRS-45

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
Oregon											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$75.56	\$30.42	\$24.80	\$15.66	\$4.68	-84.6%	\$8.64	\$6.96	\$4.36	\$1.29	-85.1%
LETPP	\$16.45	na	\$7.36	\$5.69	\$3.40	-53.8%	\$0.00	\$2.07	\$1.58	\$0.93	-54.8%
EMPG	\$10.16	\$2.42	\$2.55	\$2.55	\$2.64	8.9%	\$0.69	\$0.72	\$0.71	\$0.72	5.4%
MMRS	\$1.14	\$0.28	\$0.40	\$0.23	\$0.23	-17.9%	\$0.08	\$0.11	\$0.06	\$0.06	-20.5%
CCP	\$1.28	\$0.28	\$0.52	\$0.20	\$0.28	0.0%	\$0.08	\$0.15	\$0.06	\$0.08	-3.3%
UASI											
Portland	\$34.78	\$6.77	\$8.16	\$10.49	\$9.36	38.3%	\$1.92	\$2.29	\$2.92	\$2.57	33.7%
CIP	\$2.94	\$2.94	na	na	na	na	\$0.83	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$142.31	\$43.11	\$43.79	\$34.82	\$20.59	-52.2%	\$12.24	\$12.29	\$9.70	\$5.65	-53.8%
Pennsylvania											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$170.51	\$67.76	\$55.26	\$34.68	\$12.81	-81.1%	\$5.50	\$4.47	\$2.80	\$1.03	-81.3%
LETPP	\$40.06	na	\$16.40	\$12.61	\$11.05	-32.6%	\$0.00	\$1.33	\$1.02	\$0.89	-33.0%
EMPG	\$22.64	\$5.40	\$5.68	\$5.69	\$5.87	8.7%	\$0.44	\$0.46	\$0.46	\$0.47	7.8%
MMRS	\$1.88	\$0.56	\$0.40	\$0.46	\$0.46	-17.9%	\$0.05	\$0.03	\$0.04	\$0.04	-18.6%

CRS-46

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
CCP	\$2.83	\$0.62	\$1.15	\$0.44	\$0.62	0.0%	\$0.05	\$0.09	\$0.04	\$0.05	-0.8%
UASI											
Philadelphia	\$79.64	\$14.22	\$23.08	\$22.82	\$19.52	37.3%	\$1.15	\$1.87	\$1.84	\$1.57	36.1%
Pittsburgh	\$33.31	\$6.82	\$11.98	\$9.64	\$4.87	-28.6%	\$0.55	\$0.97	\$0.78	\$0.39	-29.2%
CIP	\$6.56	\$6.56	na	na	na	na	\$0.53	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$357.43	\$101.94	\$113.95	\$86.34	\$55.20	-45.8%	\$8.27	\$9.22	\$6.97	\$4.44	-46.3%
Rhode Island											
Population**							1,068,550	1,075,729	1,079,916	1,076,189	0.7%
SHSGP	\$51.11	\$20.03	\$16.33	\$10.29	\$4.46	-77.7%	\$18.75	\$15.18	\$9.53	\$4.14	-77.9%
LETPP	\$11.55	na	\$4.85	\$3.74	\$2.96	-39.0%	\$0.00	\$4.51	\$3.46	\$2.75	-39.0%
EMPG	\$6.70	\$1.60	\$1.68	\$1.68	\$1.74	8.5%	\$1.50	\$1.56	\$1.56	\$1.61	7.7%
MMRS	\$0.94	\$0.48	\$0.00	\$0.23	\$0.23	-52.1%	\$0.45	\$0.00	\$0.21	\$0.21	-52.4%
CCP	\$0.84	\$0.18	\$0.34	\$0.13	\$0.19	5.6%	\$0.17	\$0.32	\$0.12	\$0.18	4.8%
UASI	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$1.94	\$1.94	na	na	na	na	\$1.82	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$73.08	\$24.23	\$23.20	\$16.07	\$9.58	-60.5%	\$22.68	\$21.57	\$14.88	\$8.90	-60.8%

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)					Per Capita Amount					
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
South Carolina											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$86.70	\$32.90	\$26.83	\$16.93	\$10.04	-69.5%	\$8.02	\$6.47	\$4.03	\$2.36	-70.6%
LETPP	\$18.21	na	\$7.96	\$6.15	\$4.10	-48.5%	\$0.00	\$1.92	\$1.47	\$0.96	-49.8%
EMPG	\$10.99	\$2.62	\$2.76	\$2.76	\$2.85	8.8%	\$0.64	\$0.67	\$0.66	\$0.67	4.9%
MMRS	\$1.19	\$0.48	\$0.25	\$0.23	\$0.23	-52.1%	\$0.12	\$0.06	\$0.05	\$0.05	-53.8%
CCP	\$1.38	\$0.30	\$0.56	\$0.21	\$0.31	3.3%	\$0.07	\$0.14	\$0.05	\$0.07	-0.4%
UASI	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$3.18	\$3.18	na	na	na	na	\$0.78	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$121.65	\$39.48	\$38.36	\$26.28	\$17.53	-55.6%	\$9.62	\$9.25	\$6.26	\$4.12	-57.2%
South Dakota											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$47.99	\$18.72	\$15.27	\$9.62	\$4.38	-76.6%	\$24.62	\$19.97	\$12.48	\$5.64	-77.1%
LETPP	\$11.21	na	\$4.53	\$3.50	\$3.18	-29.8%	\$0.00	\$5.92	\$4.54	\$4.10	-30.8%
EMPG	\$6.25	\$1.49	\$1.57	\$1.57	\$1.62	8.9%	\$1.96	\$2.05	\$2.04	\$2.09	6.7%
MMRS	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CCP	\$0.78	\$0.17	\$0.32	\$0.12	\$0.17	0.0%	\$0.22	\$0.42	\$0.16	\$0.22	-2.0%

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
UASI	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$1.81	\$1.81	na	na	na	na	\$2.38	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$68.04	\$22.19	\$21.69	\$14.81	\$9.35	-57.9%	\$29.18	\$28.37	\$19.22	\$12.05	-58.7%
Tennessee											
Population**							5,790,312	5,841,585	5,893,298	5,962,959	3.0%
SHSGP	\$98.10	\$40.06	\$32.67	\$20.59	\$4.78	-88.1%	\$6.92	\$5.59	\$3.49	\$0.80	-88.4%
LETPP	\$20.66	na	\$9.69	\$7.49	\$3.48	-64.1%	\$0.00	\$1.66	\$1.27	\$0.58	-64.8%
EMPG	\$13.38	\$3.19	\$3.36	\$3.36	\$3.47	8.8%	\$0.55	\$0.58	\$0.57	\$0.58	5.7%
MMRS	\$4.81	\$1.52	\$1.45	\$0.91	\$0.93	-38.8%	\$0.26	\$0.25	\$0.15	\$0.16	-40.6%
CCP	\$1.67	\$0.36	\$0.68	\$0.26	\$0.37	2.8%	\$0.06	\$0.12	\$0.04	\$0.06	-0.2%
UASI											
Memphis	\$20.34	\$6.07	\$10.07	\$0.00	\$4.20	-30.8%	\$1.05	\$1.72	\$0.00	\$0.70	-32.8%
CIP	\$3.88	\$3.88	na	na	na	na	\$0.67	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$162.84	\$55.08	\$57.92	\$32.61	\$17.23	-68.7%	\$9.51	\$9.92	\$5.53	\$2.89	-69.6%
Texas											
Population**							21,722,394	22,099,136	22,471,549	22,859,968	5.2%
SHSGP	\$277.55	\$107.78	\$87.89	\$55.74	\$26.14	-75.7%	\$4.96	\$3.98	\$2.48	\$1.14	-76.9%
LETPP	\$71.09	na	\$26.08	\$20.27	\$24.74	-5.1%	\$0.00	\$1.18	\$0.90	\$1.08	-8.3%
EMPG	\$36.00	\$8.58	\$9.03	\$9.05	\$9.34	8.8%	\$0.40	\$0.41	\$0.40	\$0.41	3.4%
MMRS	\$15.18	\$4.36	\$4.84	\$2.96	\$3.02	-30.7%	\$0.20	\$0.22	\$0.13	\$0.13	-34.2%

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
CCP	\$4.54	\$0.98	\$1.83	\$0.71	\$1.02	4.1%	\$0.05	\$0.08	\$0.03	\$0.04	-1.1%
UASI											
Dallas	\$60.79	\$10.40	\$12.20	\$24.36	\$13.83	33.0%	\$0.48	\$0.55	\$1.08	\$0.61	26.4%
Houston	\$78.97	\$23.77	\$19.96	\$18.57	\$16.67	-29.9%	\$1.09	\$0.90	\$0.83	\$0.73	-33.4%
San Antonio	\$16.73	\$0.00	\$6.30	\$5.97	\$4.46	-29.2%	\$0.00	\$0.29	\$0.27	\$0.20	-31.6%
CIP	\$10.43	\$10.43	na	na	na	na	\$0.48	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$571.28	\$166.30	\$168.13	\$137.63	\$99.22	-40.3%	\$7.66	\$7.61	\$6.12	\$4.34	-43.3%
Utah											
Population**							2,336,673	2,378,696	2,420,708	2,469,585	5.7%
SHSGP	\$63.52	\$25.31	\$20.64	\$13.05	\$4.52	-82.1%	\$10.83	\$8.68	\$5.39	\$1.83	-83.1%
LETPP	\$14.15	na	\$6.13	\$4.74	\$3.28	-46.5%	\$0.00	\$2.58	\$1.96	\$1.33	-48.5%
EMPG	\$8.45	\$2.02	\$2.12	\$2.12	\$2.19	8.6%	\$0.86	\$0.89	\$0.88	\$0.89	2.7%
MMRS	\$1.14	\$0.28	\$0.40	\$0.23	\$0.23	-17.9%	\$0.12	\$0.17	\$0.10	\$0.09	-22.3%
CCP	\$1.07	\$0.23	\$0.43	\$0.17	\$0.24	4.3%	\$0.10	\$0.18	\$0.07	\$0.10	-1.3%
UASI	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$2.45	\$2.45	na	na	na	na	\$1.05	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$90.78	\$30.29	\$29.72	\$20.31	\$10.46	-65.5%	\$12.96	\$12.49	\$8.39	\$4.24	-67.3%

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)					Per Capita Amount					
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
Vermont											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$49.40	\$18.11	\$14.77	\$9.30	\$7.22	-60.1%	\$29.39	\$23.86	\$14.97	\$11.59	-60.6%
LETPP	\$11.28	na	\$4.38	\$3.38	\$3.52	-19.6%	\$0.00	\$7.07	\$5.44	\$5.65	-20.1%
EMPG	\$6.05	\$1.44	\$1.52	\$1.52	\$1.57	9.0%	\$2.34	\$2.46	\$2.45	\$2.52	7.8%
MMRS	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CCP	\$0.76	\$0.16	\$0.31	\$0.12	\$0.17	6.3%	\$0.26	\$0.50	\$0.19	\$0.27	5.1%
UASI	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$1.75	\$1.75	na	na	na	na	\$2.84	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$69.24	\$21.46	\$20.98	\$14.32	\$12.48	-41.8%	\$34.82	\$33.89	\$23.05	\$20.03	-42.5%
Virginia											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$116.88	\$46.40	\$37.84	\$23.92	\$8.72	-81.2%	\$6.37	\$5.13	\$3.20	\$1.15	-81.9%
LETPP	\$26.27	na	\$11.23	\$8.70	\$6.34	-43.5%	\$0.00	\$1.52	\$1.16	\$0.84	-44.9%
EMPG	\$15.50	\$3.70	\$3.89	\$3.89	\$4.02	8.7%	\$0.51	\$0.53	\$0.52	\$0.53	4.6%
MMRS	\$7.84	\$2.35	\$2.73	\$1.37	\$1.39	-40.9%	\$0.32	\$0.37	\$0.18	\$0.18	-43.1%
CCP	\$1.94	\$0.42	\$0.79	\$0.30	\$0.43	2.4%	\$0.06	\$0.11	\$0.04	\$0.06	-1.4%

CRS-51

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
UASI	\$6.54	\$0.00	\$6.54	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.89	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$4.49	\$4.49	na	na	na	na	\$0.62	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$179.46	\$57.36	\$63.02	\$38.18	\$20.90	-63.6%	\$7.87	\$8.54	\$5.10	\$2.76	-64.9%
Washington											
Population**							6,066,319	6,131,131	6,207,046	6,287,759	3.7%
SHSGP	\$108.76	\$41.21	\$33.61	\$21.21	\$12.73	-69.1%	\$6.79	\$5.48	\$3.42	\$2.02	-70.2%
LETPP	\$26.94	na	\$9.97	\$7.71	\$9.26	-7.1%	\$0.00	\$1.63	\$1.24	\$1.47	-9.4%
EMPG	\$13.76	\$3.28	\$3.45	\$3.46	\$3.57	8.9%	\$0.54	\$0.56	\$0.56	\$0.57	5.0%
MMRS	\$3.02	\$0.84	\$0.80	\$0.68	\$0.70	-16.7%	\$0.14	\$0.13	\$0.11	\$0.11	-19.6%
CCP	\$1.72	\$0.37	\$0.70	\$0.27	\$0.38	2.7%	\$0.06	\$0.11	\$0.04	\$0.06	-0.9%
UASI											
Seattle	\$67.05	\$29.39	\$16.52	\$11.99	\$9.15	-68.9%	\$4.84	\$2.69	\$1.93	\$1.46	-70.0%
CIP	\$3.99	\$3.99	na	na	na	na	\$0.66	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$225.24	\$79.08	\$65.05	\$45.32	\$35.79	-54.7%	\$13.04	\$10.61	\$7.30	\$5.69	-56.3%

CRS-52

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)					Per Capita Amount					
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
West Virginia											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$61.44	\$23.13	\$18.86	\$11.88	\$7.57	-67.3%	\$12.82	\$10.42	\$6.55	\$4.17	-67.5%
LETPP	\$15.43	na	\$5.60	\$4.32	\$5.51	-1.6%	\$0.00	\$3.09	\$2.38	\$3.03	-2.0%
EMPG	\$7.72	\$1.84	\$1.94	\$1.94	\$2.00	8.9%	\$1.02	\$1.07	\$1.07	\$1.10	8.2%
MMRS	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CCP	\$0.96	\$0.21	\$0.39	\$0.15	\$0.21	0.0%	\$0.12	\$0.22	\$0.08	\$0.12	-0.7%
UASI	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$2.24	\$2.24	na	na	na	na	\$1.24	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$87.79	\$27.42	\$26.79	\$18.29	\$15.29	-44.2%	\$15.20	\$14.80	\$10.09	\$8.42	-44.6%
Wisconsin											
Population**											
SHSGP	\$98.49	\$38.55	\$31.44	\$19.79	\$8.71	-77.4%	\$7.09	\$5.75	\$3.60	\$1.57	-77.8%
LETPP	\$22.86	na	\$9.33	\$7.20	\$6.33	-32.2%	\$0.00	\$1.71	\$1.31	\$1.14	-32.9%
EMPG	\$12.88	\$3.07	\$3.23	\$3.24	\$3.34	8.8%	\$0.56	\$0.59	\$0.59	\$0.60	6.9%
MMRS	\$2.28	\$0.56	\$0.80	\$0.46	\$0.46	-17.9%	\$0.10	\$0.15	\$0.08	\$0.08	-19.3%
CCP	\$1.61	\$0.35	\$0.65	\$0.25	\$0.36	2.9%	\$0.06	\$0.12	\$0.05	\$0.07	1.1%

CRS-53

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
UASI											
Milwaukee	\$25.08	\$0.00	\$10.18	\$6.33	\$8.57	-15.8%	\$0.00	\$1.86	\$1.15	\$1.55	-16.8%
CIP	\$3.73	\$3.73	na	na	na	na	\$0.69	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$166.93	\$46.26	\$55.63	\$37.27	\$27.77	-40.0%	\$8.51	\$10.17	\$6.77	\$5.02	-41.0%
Wyoming											
Population**							499,045	501,915	505,887	509,294	2.1%
SHSGP	\$45.44	\$17.61	\$14.36	\$9.05	\$4.42	-74.9%	\$35.29	\$28.61	\$17.89	\$8.68	-75.4%
LETPP	\$10.64	na	\$4.26	\$3.29	\$3.09	-27.5%	\$0.00	\$8.49	\$6.50	\$6.07	-28.5%
EMPG	\$5.90	\$1.41	\$1.48	\$1.48	\$1.53	8.2%	\$2.83	\$2.95	\$2.93	\$3.00	6.1%
MMRS	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CCP	\$0.73	\$0.16	\$0.30	\$0.11	\$0.16	0.0%	\$0.32	\$0.60	\$0.22	\$0.31	-2.0%
UASI	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$1.71	\$1.71	na	na	na	na	\$3.43	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$64.42	\$20.89	\$20.40	\$13.93	\$9.20	-56.0%	\$41.86	\$40.64	\$27.54	\$18.06	-56.9%
Puerto Rico											
Population**							3,859,606	3,877,881	3,895,107	3,912,054	1.4%
SHSGP	\$78.46	\$31.85	\$25.97	\$16.34	\$4.30	-86.5%	\$8.25	\$6.70	\$4.20	\$1.10	-86.7%

CRS-54

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
LETPP	\$16.78	na	\$7.71	\$5.94	\$3.13	-59.4%	\$0.00	\$1.99	\$1.53	\$0.80	-59.8%
EMPG	\$10.64	\$2.54	\$2.67	\$2.67	\$2.76	8.6%	\$0.66	\$0.69	\$0.69	\$0.71	7.2%
MMRS	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CCP	\$1.33	\$0.29	\$0.54	\$0.21	\$0.29	0.0%	\$0.08	\$0.14	\$0.05	\$0.07	-1.3%
UASI	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
CIP	\$3.08	\$3.08	na	na	na	na	\$0.80	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$110.29	\$37.76	\$36.89	\$25.16	\$10.48	-72.2%	\$9.78	\$9.51	\$6.46	\$2.68	-72.6%
U.S. Virgin Is.											
Population**							108,612	108,612	108,612	108,612	0.0%
SHSGP	\$14.67	\$5.63	\$4.59	\$2.89	\$1.56	-72.3%	\$51.84	\$42.26	\$26.61	\$14.36	-72.3%
LETPP	\$3.54	na	\$1.36	\$1.05	\$1.13	-16.9%	\$0.00	\$12.52	\$9.67	\$10.40	-16.9%
EMPG	\$2.54	\$0.63	\$0.63	\$0.63	\$0.65	3.8%	\$5.80	\$5.80	\$5.80	\$6.02	3.8%
CCP	\$0.24	\$0.05	\$0.10	\$0.04	\$0.05	0.0%	\$0.46	\$0.92	\$0.37	\$0.46	0.0%
CIP	\$0.55	\$0.55	na	na	na	na	\$5.06	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$21.54	\$6.86	\$6.68	\$4.61	\$3.39	-50.5%	\$63.16	\$61.50	\$42.44	\$31.25	-50.5%
American Samoa											
Population**							57,794	57,794	57,794	57,794	0.0%
SHSGP	\$14.72	\$5.41	\$4.41	\$2.78	\$2.12	-60.8%	\$93.61	\$76.31	\$48.10	\$36.68	-60.8%
LETPP	\$4.85	na	\$1.31	\$1.01	\$2.53	93.1%	\$0.00	\$22.67	\$17.48	\$43.78	93.1%

CRS-55

State and Program	Amount Allocated (in millions)						Per Capita Amount				
	FY2003 to FY2006 Total	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Percent Change* FY2003 to FY2006
EMPG	\$1.80	\$0.43	\$0.45	\$0.45	\$0.47	9.0%	\$7.44	\$7.79	\$7.79	\$8.11	9.0%
CCP	\$0.23	\$0.05	\$0.09	\$0.04	\$0.05	0.0%	\$0.87	\$1.56	\$0.69	\$0.87	0.0%
CIP	\$0.52	\$0.52	na	na	na	na	\$9.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$22.12	\$6.41	\$6.26	\$4.28	\$5.17	-19.4%	\$110.91	\$108.32	\$74.06	\$89.43	-19.4%
Guam											
Population**							171,019	171,019	171,019	171,019	0.0%
SHSGP	\$15.11	\$5.82	\$4.75	\$2.99	\$1.55	-73.4%	\$34.03	\$27.77	\$17.48	\$9.06	-73.4%
LETPP	\$3.63	na	\$1.41	\$1.09	\$1.13	-19.9%	\$0.00	\$8.24	\$6.37	\$6.61	-19.9%
EMPG	\$2.38	\$0.59	\$0.59	\$0.59	\$0.61	3.3%	\$3.45	\$3.45	\$3.45	\$3.56	3.3%
CCP	\$0.24	\$0.05	\$0.10	\$0.04	\$0.05	0.0%	\$0.29	\$0.58	\$0.23	\$0.29	0.0%
CIP	\$0.56	\$0.56	na	na	na	na	\$3.27	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$21.92	\$7.02	\$6.85	\$4.71	\$3.34	-52.4%	\$41.05	\$40.05	\$27.54	\$19.53	-52.4%
Northern Marianas											
Population**							82,459	82,459	82,459	82,459	0.0%
SHSGP	\$14.42	\$5.46	\$4.45	\$2.81	\$1.70	-68.9%	\$66.21	\$53.97	\$34.08	\$20.62	-68.9%
LETPP	\$3.31	na	\$1.32	\$1.02	\$0.97	-26.5%	\$0.00	\$16.01	\$12.37	\$11.76	-26.5%
EMPG	\$1.90	\$0.47	\$0.47	\$0.47	\$0.49	3.7%	\$5.70	\$5.70	\$5.70	\$5.91	3.7%
CCP	\$0.23	\$0.05	\$0.09	\$0.04	\$0.05	0.0%	\$0.61	\$1.09	\$0.49	\$0.61	0.0%
CIP	\$0.53	\$0.53	na	na	na	na	\$6.43	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$20.39	\$6.51	\$6.33	\$4.34	\$3.21	-50.7%	\$78.95	\$76.77	\$52.63	\$38.90	-50.7%

Total for the United States, Puerto Rico, and Outlying Areas											
Population**							287,984,799	290,850,005	293,656,842	296,410,404	2.9%
SHSGP	\$5,341.76	\$2,066.30	\$1,685.00	\$1,062.29	\$528.17	-74.4%	\$7.18	\$5.79	\$3.62	\$1.78	-75.2%
LETPP	\$1,270.41	na	\$500.00	\$386.29	\$384.12	-23.2%	\$0.00	\$1.72	\$1.32	\$1.30	-24.6%
EMPG	\$691.99	\$165.14	\$173.57	\$173.83	\$179.45	8.7%	\$0.57	\$0.60	\$0.59	\$0.61	5.6%
MMRS	\$145.47	\$42.29	\$46.15	\$28.22	\$28.81	-31.9%	\$0.15	\$0.16	\$0.10	\$0.10	-33.8%
CCP	\$86.50	\$18.80	\$35.00	\$13.49	\$19.21	2.2%	\$0.07	\$0.12	\$0.05	\$0.06	-0.7%
UASI	\$2,822.23	\$596.35	\$665.72	\$849.54	\$710.62	19.2%	\$2.07	\$2.29	\$2.89	\$2.40	15.8%
CIP	\$200.00	\$200.00	na	na	na	na	\$0.69	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	na
Total	\$10,558.36	\$3,088.88	\$3,105.44	\$2,513.66	\$1,850.38	-40.1%	\$10.73	\$10.68	\$8.56	\$6.24	-45.9%

Source: Data for FY2003 to FY2005 are from U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office for Domestic Preparedness, program guidance and application kit for each respective fiscal year. For FY2006, the data are from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office of Grants and Training.

* In some instances, the beginning year for calculating percentage change is a fiscal year later than FY2003.

** Population for the stated fiscal year is the population estimate on July 1 of the previous calendar year. For example, the population estimate for FY2006 is the population on July 1, 2005.

a. CRS calculations based on FY2003 CCP appropriations (P.L. 108-7).

b. The National Capital Region population used for this table is the Maryland, Virginia, and Washington, D.C., 2002 estimated population from the U.S. Census Bureau.